arXiv:1205.6493v3 [math.PR] 13 Feb 2013

Parabolic Harnack inequality for time-dependent non-symmetric Dirichlet forms

Janna Lierl Laurent Saloff-Coste *

February 14, 2013

Abstract

This paper introduces conditions on the symmetric and skew-symmetric parts of time-dependent bilinear forms that imply a parabolic Harnack inequality for appropriate weak solutions of the associated heat equation, under natural assumptions on the underlying space. In particular, these local weak solutions are locally bounded and Hölder continuous.

Introduction

This paper is concerned with parabolic Harnack inequalities for weak solutions of the heat equation associated with non-symmetric, time-dependent, closed bilinear forms that are local, regular and generalize non-symmetric Dirichlet forms.

In ground breaking works, Nash [26] and Moser [23, 24, 25] studied the weak solutions of second order uniformly elliptic divergence form equations in Euclidean spaces. The article [1] by Aronson and Serrin provides a very detailed and complete account centered around the parabolic Harnack inequality. See also [28, 8, 33]. As observed by Moser, the parabolic Harnack inequality implies the fundamental result that weak solutions of the relevant equation are locally bounded and Hölder continuous. More recently, the usefulness of parabolic Harnack inequalities in connection with Aronson-type two-sided heat kernel bounds has led to many further works on the subject.

For purely second order divergence form operators (with no time dependence), e.g., on complete Riemannian manifolds, Grigor'yan [11] and Saloff-Coste [30] observed that the parabolic Harnack inequality is precisely equivalent to the volume doubling property and the Poincaré inequality. This characterization of the parabolic Harnack inequality has proved very useful in the development of analysis on rough spaces including spaces equipped with a sub-Riemannian structure ([15, 31]), Lipschitz manifolds, Alexandrov spaces ([16]), polytopal complexes and Gromov-Hausdorff limits of Riemannian manifolds ([38]).

---

[*] Both authors partially supported by NSF Grant DMS 1004771

Biroli and Mosco [2] and Sturm [34, 35, 37] extended these ideas in the context of local, regular Dirichlet spaces equipped with a non-degenerate intrinsic distance. The aim of the present work is to complement in various ways the results of Sturm [35, 37]. In doing so, we were in part motivated by applications to the study of the heat semigroup with Dirichlet boundary condition in inner uniform domains. See [12, 18, 17].

To describe the content of this paper without entering into technical details, recall that the model for a regular, strictly local Dirichlet space is $\mathbb{R}^n$, equipped with Lebesgue measure, the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, dx)$ and the closed bilinear form $(f,g) \mapsto \mathcal{E}(f,g) = \int \nabla f \cdot \nabla g \, dx$ with domain the first Sobolev space $W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. See [9, 4]. For the purpose of the present work, $\mathbb{R}^n$ is replaced by a locally compact, separable space X equipped with a positive Radon measure μ and a regular, strictly local Dirichlet form $\mathcal{E}(f,g)$, $f,g \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E})$. In great generality, the global energy $\mathcal{E}(f,g)$ is obtained by integration of a local energy $\Gamma(f,g)$ (a signed radon measure replacing $\nabla f \cdot \nabla g \, dx$). This setting easily leads to the appropriate notion of a *local weak solution of the associated heat equation* (see, e.g., [35, 37]).

In great generality, we can associate to any such $\mathcal{E}$ a "geometry" defined via a "distance function" called the intrinsic distance and denoted here by $d_{\mathcal{E}}$ (see [2, 36]). This "distance" may, a priori, take the values 0 or infinity but we will make the fundamental assumption that $d_{\mathcal{E}}$ is a genuine distance function which defines the topology of X and turns $(X, d_{\mathcal{E}})$ into a complete metric space with metric balls $B(x,r)$. Having made this hypothesis, we can now consider the following properties:

- (Doubling) $\exists\, D,\ \forall\, x, r,\ \mu(B(x,2r)) \leq D\mu(B(x,r))$.
- (Poincaré) $\exists\, P,\ \forall\, x, r,\ f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E})$,
$$\min_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{B(x,r)} |f-\xi|^2 d\mu \leq P r^2 \int_{B(x,2r)} d\Gamma(f,f).$$
- The parabolic Harnack inequality for non-negative local weak solution of the heat equation in appropriate time-space cylinders $Q(s,x,r) = (s, s+r^2) \times B(x,r)$.

Generalizing the aforementioned results of Grigor'yan and Saloff-Coste, Sturm proved that the conjunction of the first two properties is equivalent to the third. This implies that, under the hypothesis that the first two properties holds (in fact, a local assumption of this type suffices), any local weak solution of the associated heat equation is locally bounded and Hölder continuous. In this generality, this is quite a remarkable result since, for instance, there is no way to "approximate" such a weak solution by better behaved functions as one could in $\mathbb{R}^n$ by smoothing the coefficients of the equation.

Aronson and Serrin [1] developed the theory of parabolic Harnack inequalities for quasi-linear divergence form equations having the proper structure. This includes time-dependent linear equations in divergence form with uniformly elliptic second order term, first and zero order terms with bounded coefficients, that is,

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t u(t,x) &= \sum_{i,j} \partial_j (a_{i,j}(t,x)\partial_i u(t,x)) \\ + \quad & \sum_i b_i(t,x)\partial_i u(t,x) + \sum_j \partial_j (d_j(t,x)u(t,x)) + c(t,x)u(t,x), \qquad (0.1)\end{aligned}$$

to be interpreted in the weak sense and where $a_{i,j}, b_i, d_j$ and c are bounded measurable functions with, $\forall\, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\sum_{i,j} a_{i,j}(t,x)\xi_i\xi_j \geq \epsilon|\xi|^2$, $\epsilon > 0$. If the lower order coefficients b_i, d_i and c all vanish, then the weak solutions satisfy a global scale invariant parabolic Harnack inequality even when $a_{i,j}$ is time-dependent and not necessarily symmetric. This provides a two-sided Aronson heat kernel estimate that is global in time and space. One goal of this paper is to obtain a similar result in the context of Dirichlet spaces. See Corollary 3.7.

We consider equations that generalize (0.1) in the context of a given symmetric, strictly local Dirichlet space $(X, \mathcal{E})$ satisfying the volume doubling property and the Poincaré inequality. These equations are associated with (time-dependent) closed forms $\mathcal{E}_t$ with domain $D(\mathcal{E}_t) = D(\mathcal{E})$. These forms are local, possibly non-symmetric, and generalize Dirichlet forms (see [20]). We introduce natural hypotheses on the symmetric, strictly local part, the skew-symmetric part and the zero order part of $\mathcal{E}_t$, that allow us to use the well established Moser iteration technique. See Section 1.4. Since Moser iteration itself is well understood, the main point is to justify carefully the application of this technique to local weak solutions of the associated heat equation. This work is closely related to [35, 37] where similar questions are discussed and the Moser iteration technique is used in the same way. The paper [37] proves a parabolic Harnack inequality for local weak solutions of the heat equation associated with symmetric, time-dependent, strictly local Dirichlet forms that are all uniformly comparable to a fixed symmetric, strictly local, regular Dirichlet form satisfying the doubling property and the Poincaré inequality. The work [35] contains further developments towards the parabolic Harnack inequality for a more general class of (non-symmetric) Dirichlet forms. However, we have encountered difficulty in justifying applying [35] to general weak solutions whose local boundedness is not known, a priori. The hypotheses we make here on the forms $\mathcal{E}_t$ are in a somewhat different spirit than those considered in [35] (in a certain sense, they are also more restrictive; in another sense, they are more general). We carefully explain how these hypotheses allow us to follow [1] and treat local weak solutions without an a priori assumption on their local boundedness.

The results obtained in this paper involve two types of assumptions. The first type concerns the structure of the forms $\mathcal{E}_t$. They are introduced in Sections 1.2 and 1.4 as Assumptions 0, 1 and 2. The second type of assumptions concerns the underlying space, these are introduced in Section 2.1 as Assumptions 3 and 4.

The main results (Harnack inequality and Hölder continuity of weak solutions) are stated in Theorem 2.13, Corollary 2.14 and Corollary 2.16. Applications to heat kernels are described in Section 3.

1 Non-symmetric forms

The classical theory of symmetric Dirichlet forms is developed in [9]. For the notion of non-symmetric Dirichlet forms see [20].

Let X be a locally compact, separable metrizable space and let μ be a non-negative Borel measure on X that is finite on compact sets and positive on non-empty open sets. On this space, we will consider bilinear forms that generalize (non-symmetric) local Dirichlet forms.

1.1 The model form

Throughout this paper, we fix a symmetric, strictly local, regular Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}, D(\mathcal{E}))$ on $L^2(X,\mu)$ with energy measure Γ. In particular,

$$\mathcal{E}(f,g) = \int d\Gamma(f,g), \quad \forall f,g \in D(\mathcal{E}).$$

Recall that the energy measure Γ satisfies a chain rule: For any $v, u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_m \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C}_c(X)$, $u = (u_1, \ldots, u_m)$ and $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^m)$, we have

$$d\Gamma(\Phi(u), v) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \Phi_{x_i}(\tilde{u}) d\Gamma(u_i, v),$$

where $\tilde{u}$ is a quasi-continous version of u, see [9, Theorem 3.2.2]. Note that in [9] the energy measure is denoted as $2\mu^c_{<u,v>}$. Further, Γ satisfies a sort of Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (cf. [9, Lemma 5.6.1])

$$\left| \int fg \, d\Gamma(u,v) \right| \leq \left(\int f^2 d\Gamma(u,u) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int g^2 d\Gamma(v,v) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{1.1}$$

for any $f, g \in D(\mathcal{E}) \cap L^\infty(X)$, $u, v \in D(\mathcal{E})$, or $f, v \in D(\mathcal{E}) \cap L^\infty(X)$, $g, u \in D(\mathcal{E})$. Here, on the right hand side, quasi-continuous versions of f and g must be used. Inequality (1.1) together with a Leibniz rule ([9, Lemma 3.2.5]) implies that

$$\int d\Gamma(fg, fg) \leq 2 \int f^2 d\Gamma(g,g) + 2 \int g^2 d\Gamma(f,f), \;\; f, g \in D(\mathcal{E}) \cap L^\infty(X). \tag{1.2}$$

Because the domain of $\mathcal{E}$ plays a fundamental role, we set

$$\mathcal{F} = D(\mathcal{E}) \text{ and } \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}} = \left(\int |f|^2 d\mu + \int d\Gamma(f,f) \right)^{1/2}.$$

In our context, the space $\mathcal{F}$ plays the role of the first Sobolev space. By definition, the support of $f \in L^2(X, d\mu)$ is the support of the measure $f d\mu$. For an open set $U \subset X$, we set

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}(U) := \{f \in D(\mathcal{E}) : \text{ The essential support of } f \text{ is compact in } U.\}$$
$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(U) := \{f \in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(U) : \forall \text{ compact } K \subset U,\ \exists f^\sharp \in D(\mathcal{E}), f = f^\sharp\big|_K \text{ a.e.}\}.$$

Note that $\Gamma(f,g)$ can be defined for $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(U)$ and $v \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}(U)$ by virtue of [9, Corollary 3.2.1]. For convenience, we set $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}(X)$. We will use this notation throughout. One fundamental assumption for the results of this paper is that all other bilinear forms on $L^2(X, \mu)$ that we will consider will share with $\mathcal{E}$ the same domain $\mathcal{F}$.

1.2 Basic structural assumptions on forms

In this section, we introduce some basic notation and definitions regarding bilinear forms.

Let $(\mathfrak{E}, D(\mathfrak{E}))$ be a (possibly non-symmetric) bilinear form on $L^2(X, \mu)$. Let

$$\mathfrak{E}^{\mathrm{sym}}(f,g) = \frac{1}{2}\big(\mathfrak{E}(f,g) + \mathfrak{E}(g,f)\big)$$

be the symmetric part of $\mathfrak{E}$ and

$$\mathfrak{E}^{\mathrm{skew}}(f,g) = \frac{1}{2}\big(\mathfrak{E}(f,g) - \mathfrak{E}(g,f)\big)$$

the skew-symmetric part.

Recall that $(\mathfrak{E}, D(\mathfrak{E}))$ is local if $\mathfrak{E}(f,g) = 0$ for any pair $f, g \in D(\mathfrak{E})$ with compact disjoint supports. The form $(\mathfrak{E}, D(\mathfrak{E}))$ is strictly local if $\mathfrak{E}(f,g) = 0$ for any pair $f, g \in D(\mathfrak{E})$ with compact supports with f constant on a neighborhood of the support of g or vice versa. We say that 1 is locally in the domain of $\mathfrak{E}$ if for any compact set $K \subset X$ there is a function $f_K \in D(\mathfrak{E})$ with compact support and such that $f_K = 1$ in a neighborhood of K. If that is the case and $\mathfrak{E}$ is local then $\mathfrak{E}(u,1)$ and $\mathfrak{E}(1,u)$ are well defined for any function $u \in D(\mathfrak{E})$ with compact support. Indeed, assuming that the support of u is K, set $\mathfrak{E}(u,1) = \mathfrak{E}(u, f_K)$ and note that the result is independent of the choice of the function $f_K \in D(\mathfrak{E})$ which equals 1 on a neighborhood of K.

Example 1.1. *On $X = \mathbb{R}$, for any choice of $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, the form $(f,g) \mapsto \mathfrak{E}(f,g) = \int f^{(k_1)} g^{(k_2)} dx$ where $f^{(k)}$ denotes the k-th derivative of f and $f, g \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_c(\mathbb{R})$ is local. It is strictly local if and only if either $k_1 k_2 \neq 0$ or $k_1 = 0 < k_2$, or $k_1 > 0 = k_2$. However, in the latter two cases, the symmetric part of the form is degenerate.*

Definition 1.2. *Assume that $(\mathfrak{E}, D(\mathfrak{E}))$ is local and that 1 is locally in $D(\mathfrak{E})$. Define the bilinear forms $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{E}}$ and $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_{\mathfrak{E}}$ by*

$$\mathcal{L}(u,v) = \frac{1}{4}\big[\mathfrak{E}(uv,1) - \mathfrak{E}(1,uv) + \mathfrak{E}(u,v) - \mathfrak{E}(v,u)\big],$$

$$\mathcal{R}(u,v) = \frac{1}{4}\big[\mathfrak{E}(1,uv) - \mathfrak{E}(uv,1) + \mathfrak{E}(u,v) - \mathfrak{E}(v,u)\big] = -\mathcal{L}(v,u),$$

for any $u, v \in D(\mathfrak{E})$ with uv having compact support and $uv \in D(\mathfrak{E})$.

Remark 1.3. (i) Without further assumption, it is not clear that there are many $u, v \in D(\mathfrak{E})$ such that $uv \in D(\mathfrak{E})$. We will use this definition only in cases where there are plenty of such u, v.

(ii) The locality of $\mathfrak{E}$ implies that $\mathcal{L}$ is *left-strictly local*, i.e. $\mathcal{L}(u,v) = 0$ if u, v have compact support and u is constant on a neighborhood of the support of v. Moreover, for any $u, v \in D(\mathfrak{E})$ with uv of compact support and $uv \in D(\mathfrak{E})$,

$$\mathfrak{E}^{\text{skew}}(u,v) = \mathcal{L}(u,v) + \mathcal{R}(u,v). \tag{1.3}$$

We recall the following important properties of the domain $\mathcal{F}$ of a regular strictly local Dirichlet form.

Proposition 1.4.

- *$\mathcal{F} \cap L^\infty(X,\mu)$ is an algebra.*
- *If $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^m)$, and $u_1, \dots, u_m \in \mathcal{F} \cap L^\infty(X,\mu)$, $u = (u_1, \dots, u_m)$, then $\Phi(u) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$.*

Proof. See [9, Theorem 1.4.2 and (3.2.27)]. □

Example 1.5. *In the case $(f,g) \mapsto \mathfrak{E}(f,g) = \int (f^{(k_1)} g^{(k_2)} + fg)dx$, $f, g \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{E}^{\text{sym}}(f,g) &= \int \left(\frac{1}{2}(f^{(k_1)}g^{(k_2)} + f^{(k_2)}g^{(k_1)}) + fg\right) dx,\\
\mathfrak{E}^{\text{skew}}(f,g) &= \int \frac{1}{2}(f^{(k_1)}g^{(k_2)} - f^{(k_2)}g^{(k_1)}) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

If $k_1 = 1, k_2 = 0$, then $\mathcal{L}(f,g) = \frac{1}{2}\int f'g dx$. If $k_1 = 2, k_2 = 0$, then $\mathcal{L}(f,g) = \frac{1}{2}\int (f''g + f'g')dx$. Anticipating on the definition of a "first order skew part" given below, note that the skew part of $\mathfrak{E}$ is of first order in the case $k_1 = 1, k_2 = 0$ but is not in the case $k_1 = 2, k_2 = 0$.

Changing notation to emphasize the fact that we now make an important extra hypothesis, we consider a bilinear form $\mathcal{E}_*$ whose domain $D(\mathcal{E}_*)$ is equal to the domain $\mathcal{F}$ of our model form $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$. Since the model form is a symmetric strictly local regular Dirichlet form, $\mathcal{F}$ has many good properties including the fact that $1 \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$ and that $\mathcal{F}_c \cap L^\infty(X,\mu)$ is an algebra and is dense in the Hilbert space $(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}})$. We will use freely the notation $\mathcal{E}_*^{\text{sym}}, \mathcal{E}_*^{\text{skew}}, \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}_*}$ and $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{E}_*}$.

Definition 1.6. *Assuming $\mathcal{E}_*$ is local with $D(\mathcal{E}_*) = \mathcal{F}$, we say that $\mathcal{E}_*^{\text{skew}}$ is a* first order skew form relative to $\mathcal{F}$ *if the following two properties hold:*

- *For any $u, v, f \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C}_c(X)$, we have*

$$\mathcal{L}(uf, v) = \mathcal{L}(u, fv) + \mathcal{L}(f, uv).$$

- *Let $v, u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_m \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{c}}(X)$ and $u = (u_1, \ldots, u_m)$. For any $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^m)$,*

$$\mathcal{L}(\Phi(u), v) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathcal{L}(u_i, \Phi_{x_i}(u)v).$$

Remark 1.7. (i) The name "first order skew form" is perhaps not completely satisfactory since such a form can include a term associated with the second order part of the infinitesimal generator if that second order part is not symmetric. See Example 1.12 below. It refers to the fact that the skew form in question satisfies natural "derivation type" properties. Note that, not surprisingly, these derivation properties are not symmetric in the argument.

(ii) By Proposition 1.4, when $u_1, \ldots, u_m$ are in $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{c}}(X)$ then $\Phi(u)$ and $\Phi_{x_i}(u)$ are in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}$, for any $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^m)$.

Remark 1.8. When $\mathcal{E}_*$ is a non-symmetric local regular Dirichlet form, then its skew part is of first order with respect to the domain of the form itself, see [14, Theorems 3.2 and 3.8]. Note that $\mathcal{L}(u, fv)$ is the same as $\langle L(u,v), f\rangle$ in their notation.

Note that the following structural assumptions refer to the domain $\mathcal{F}$ of the model form $\mathcal{E}$.

Assumption 0. *The form $(\mathcal{E}_*, D(\mathcal{E}_*))$ is local, its domain $D(\mathcal{E}_*)$ is $\mathcal{F}$ and:*

(i) The form $\mathcal{E}_*$ satisfies

$$\forall\, f, g \in \mathcal{F}, \ \ |\mathcal{E}_*(f,g)| \le C_* \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}} \|g\|_{\mathcal{F}},$$

and, for all $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ with $fg \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}$,

$$|\mathcal{E}_*(fg, 1)| + |\mathcal{E}_*(1, fg)| \le C_* \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}} \|g\|_{\mathcal{F}}.$$

(ii) The symmetric bilinear form $\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{s}}(f,g) = \mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{sym}}(f,g) - \mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{sym}}(fg,1)$, defined for $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ with $fg \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}$, extends to a regular strictly local symmetric Dirichlet form with domain $\mathcal{F}$. Let Γ_* be the energy measure of $\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{s}}$.

(iii) The skew part $\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{skew}}$ is of first order with respect to $\mathcal{F}$.

Remark 1.9. (i) Under Assumption 0(i), the form $\mathcal{E}_*$ as well as each of the components $\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{s}}$, $\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{sym}}$, $\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{skew}}$ is continuous on $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F}$. Further $(f,g) \mapsto \mathcal{E}_*(fg,1)$ and $(f,g) \mapsto \mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{sym}}(fg,1)$ extend continuously to $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F}$.

(ii) Note that, under Assumption 0, $f \mapsto \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $f \mapsto (\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{s}}(f,f) + \int |f|^2 d\mu)^{1/2}$ are two equivalent norms on $\mathcal{F}$.

(iii) Assume further that

$$|\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{sym}}(f^2,1)| \le C\|f\|_2\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}},$$

for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$ with $f^2 \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}$, where $\|f\|_2 = \left(\int |f|^2 d\mu\right)^{1/2}$. Then there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathcal{E}_* + \lambda\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_\mu$ is a coercive closed form. In addition, this form is positivity preserving. See [21] and Proposition 1.10. In fact, the form $(\mathcal{E}_*, \mathcal{F})$ itself is closed and positivity preserving.

(iv) Assume that $(\mathcal{E}_*, \mathcal{F})$ is a (non-symmetric) local Dirichlet form. In order for Assumption 0 to be satisfied, we need to assume that the strictly local part of $\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{sym}}$ is itself a regular Dirichlet form with domain $\mathcal{F}$. This puts restrictions on its skew part and on the zero order symmetric part $\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{sym}}(fg,1)$.

Proposition 1.10 (Strong version of the locality properties)**.** *Under* Assumption 0*, the following holds:*

(i) If $u,v \in \mathcal{F}$ are such that $uv = 0$ μ–a.e. then $\mathcal{E}_*(u,v) = 0$.

(ii) If $u,v \in \mathcal{F}$ are such that there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $(u-c)v = 0$ μ a.e. then $\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{s}}(u,v) = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}(u,v) = 0$.

Proof. See the proof of [4, Theorems 2.4.2 and 2.4.3]. The essential point here is that the common domain of these forms is $\mathcal{F}$, the domain of a regular Dirichlet form, and the fact that these forms are continuous on $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F}$ thanks to Assumption 0(i). □

Example 1.11. *On $X = \mathbb{R}$ equipped with Lebesgue measure dx, let a,b,c be bounded measurable functions and consider*

$$\mathcal{E}_*(f,g) = \int f'g'dx + \int a(f'g - g'f)dx + \int b(f'g + fg')dx + \int cfgdx$$

with domain the first Sobolev space $\mathcal{F} = W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R})$. Then $\mathcal{E}_*$ obviously satisfies Assumption 0. Assume that the distributions a', b' are signed Radon measures (obviously, this is not always the case!). The form $\mathcal{E}_*$ is not a Dirichlet form in general. Indeed, for $\mathcal{E}_*$ to be a Dirichlet form it is necessary that

$$c \ge b' - a' \text{ and } c \ge b' + a'.$$

If γ is a non-negative Radon measure such that $c+\gamma \ge b'-a'$ and $c+\gamma \ge b'+a'$ then $(f,g) \mapsto \mathcal{E}_*(f,g) + \gamma(fg)$ is a Dirichlet form on $L^2(\mathbb{R}, dx)$ but its domain $\mathcal{F} \cap L^2(\mathbb{R},\gamma)$ will, in general, be smaller than the first Sobolev space $\mathcal{F}$.

Example 1.12. *On Euclidean space $X = \mathbb{R}^n$, consider the form*

$$\mathcal{E}_*(f,g) = \int \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{i,j}\partial_i f \partial_j g + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \partial_i f\, g + \sum_{i=1}^n f\, d_i \partial_i g + cfg \right) dx,$$

with coefficients $a = (a_{i,j})$, $b = (b_i)$, $d = (d_i)$, c satisfying *(i)* $\sum_{i,j=1}^n |a_{i,j} - a_{j,i}| \le M$ *for some* $M > 0$,

(ii) *there are positive constants* k_0, K_0 *such that* $k_0|\xi|^2 \le \sum_{i,j} a_{i,j}\xi_i\xi_j \le K_0|\xi|^2$ *for all* $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Set $\tilde{a}_{i,j} := (a_{i,j} + a_{j,i})/2$ *and* $\check{a}_{i,j} = (a_{i,j} - a_{j,i})/2$. *Then the symmetric part of* $\mathcal{E}$ *is*

$$\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{sym}}(f,g) = \int \sum_{i,j=1}^n \tilde{a}_{i,j}\partial_i f \partial_j g\,dx + \int \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{b_i + d_i}{2}\partial_i f\, g\,dx$$
$$+ \int \sum_{i=1}^n f\,\frac{b_i + d_i}{2}\partial_i g\,dx + \int cfg\,dx,$$

while the skew-symmetric part of $\mathcal{E}$ *is*

$$\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{skew}}(f,g) = \int \sum_{i,j=1}^n \check{a}_{i,j}\partial_i f \partial_j g\,dx + \int \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{b_i - d_i}{2}\partial_i f\, g\,dx$$
$$+ \int \sum_{i=1}^n f\,\frac{-b_i + d_i}{2}\partial_i g\,dx.$$

The symmetric part can be written as $\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{sym}}(f,g) = \mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{s}}(f,g) + \mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{sym}}(fg,1)$, *where* $\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{s}}$ *is the strictly local part*

$$\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{s}}(f,g) = \int \sum_{i,j=1}^n \tilde{a}_{i,j}\partial_i f \partial_j g\,dx.$$

The skew-symmetric part can be written as $\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{skew}}(f,g) = \mathcal{L}(f,g) + \mathcal{R}(f,g)$ *with*

$$\mathcal{L}(f,g) = \int \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\check{a}_{i,j}}{2}\partial_i f\,\partial_j g\,d\mu + \int \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{b_i - d_i}{2}\partial_i f\, g\,d\mu.$$

In the context of this paper, the coefficients $(a_{i,j}), (b_i), (d_i), c$ *can be allowed to be functions of the time-space variable* (t,x) *so that the form* $\mathcal{E}_*$ *above would also depend on* t. *In this example, if all coefficients are bounded measurable, the underlying domain* $\mathcal{F}$ *is the first Sobolev space and Assumption 0 is satisfied (with respect to that space).*

Remark 1.13. Condition (i) and (ii) in the above example is equivalent to

(ii') There are positive constants k_0, K_0 such that

$$|\sum_{i,j} a_{i,j}\xi_i\zeta_j| \le K_0|\xi||\zeta| \quad \text{for all } \xi,\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

and

$$k_0|\xi|^2 \le \sum_{i,j} a_{i,j}\xi_i\xi_j \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

1.3 Some algebraic computations

Let $\mathcal{E}_*$ be a form satisfying the structural hypotheses of Assumption 0. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. For any non-negative function $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}(X)$, set $u_\varepsilon = u + \varepsilon$. When we consider only non-negative powers of u or when u is locally uniformly positive, we may let ε be equal to zero. For a positive integer n, let

$$u_n = u_{\varepsilon,n} = (u + \varepsilon) \wedge n.$$

Lemma 1.14. *Let $0 \le u \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}(X)$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $uu_n^p \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}(X)$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove the claim for $0 \le u \in \mathcal{F}$. For any $m > n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_*^{\text{s}}(u_m u_n^p, u_m u_n^p) &= \int_{\{u+\varepsilon<n\}} d\Gamma_*(u_m u_n^p, u_m u_n^p) + \int_{\{u+\varepsilon\ge n\}} d\Gamma_*(u_m u_n^p, u_m u_n^p)\\ &= \int_{\{u+\varepsilon<n\}} d\Gamma_*(u_n^{p+1}, u_n^{p+1}) + n^{2p} \int_{\{u+\varepsilon\ge n\}} d\Gamma_*(u_m, u_m).\end{aligned}$$

The right hand side is uniformly bounded for all $m > n$. Thus, letting $m \to \infty$, we obtain that $\mathcal{E}_*^{\text{s}}(uu_n^p, uu_n^p) < \infty$. Clearly, $u_m u_n^p$ also converges in L^2. This finishes the proof. ☐

We will apply the following lemmas only in the case when $d\Gamma_*(\psi,\psi) \le c\, d\mu$ for some constant $c \in (0,\infty)$.

Lemma 1.15. *Let $\psi \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{c}}(X) \cap L^\infty(X)$. Let $0 \le u \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}(X) \cap L^2_{\text{loc}}(X, d\Gamma_*(\psi,\psi))$. Let $p \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $uu_n^{p-2}\psi^2 \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{c}}(X)$, and for any $k > 0$ it holds*

$$\begin{aligned}(1-p)\mathcal{E}_*^{\text{s}}(u, uu_n^{p-2}\psi^2) \le& 4k \int u^2 u_n^{p-2} d\Gamma_*(\psi,\psi) + \frac{|1-p|^2}{k} \int \psi^2 u_n^{p-2} d\Gamma_*(u,u)\\ &+ (1-p)(p-2) \int \psi^2 u_n^{p-2} d\Gamma_*(u_n,u_n)\\ &- \epsilon(1-p)(p-2) \int \psi^2 u_n^{p-2} d\Gamma_*(u_n,u_n)\\ &+ (1-p) \int \psi^2 u_n^{p-2} d\Gamma_*(u,u).\end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

Proof. We first consider the case that u is bounded.

$$\begin{aligned}(1-p)\mathcal{E}_*^{\text{s}}(u, uu_n^{p-2}\psi^2) =& 2(1-p) \int \psi u u_n^{p-2} d\Gamma_*(u,\psi)\\ &+ (1-p)(p-2) \int uu_n^{p-3}\psi^2 d\Gamma_*(u,u_n)\\ &+ (1-p) \int u_n^{p-2}\psi^2 d\Gamma_*(u,u).\end{aligned}$$

The first integral on the right hand side can be estimated using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Due to the strict locality, the second integral is equal to

$$\int uu_n^{p-3}\psi^2 d\Gamma_*(u+\epsilon-u_n, u_n) + \int uu_n^{p-3}\psi^2 d\Gamma_*(u_n,u_n)$$

$$= \int u_n^{p-2}\psi^2 d\Gamma_*(u_n,u_n) - \epsilon \int \psi^2 u_n^{p-2} d\Gamma_*(u_n,u_n).$$

This proves the assertion when u is bounded.

If u is unbounded, apply the assertion (1.4) with u replaced by u_m and let $m \to \infty$. Because $u \in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(X, d\Gamma_*(\psi,\psi))$ by assumption, the right hand side of the inequality stays bounded as we let $m \to \infty$. This shows that $uu_n^{p-2}\psi^2$ is in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(X)$ and that the inequality (1.4) holds also for unbounded u. ☐

Lemma 1.16. *Let $0 \neq p \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\psi \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}(X) \cap L^\infty(X)$ and $0 \leq u \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(X) \cap L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(X, d\Gamma_*(\psi,\psi))$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{skew}}(u, uu_n^{p-2}\psi^2) =& \mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{skew}}(uu_n^{\frac{p-2}{2}}, uu_n^{\frac{p-2}{2}}\psi^2) + \frac{2-p}{p}\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{skew}}(u_n^{p/2}, u_n^{p/2}\psi^2)\\ &+ \frac{2-p}{p}\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{skew}}(u_n^p\psi^2, 1).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Approximating u by u_m (and taking the limit as $m \to \infty$) if necessary, it suffices to prove the assertion for bounded u. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{skew}}(u, uu_n^{p-2}\psi^2) =& \mathcal{L}(u, uu_n^{p-2}\psi^2) + \mathcal{R}(u, uu_n^{p-2}\psi^2)\\ =& \mathcal{L}(u, uu_n^{p-2}\psi^2) - \mathcal{L}(uu_n^{p-2}, u\psi^2) + \mathcal{R}(u^2u_n^{p-2}, \psi^2)\\ =& -\mathcal{L}(u_n^{p-2}, u^2\psi^2) + \mathcal{R}(u^2u_n^{p-2}, \psi^2).\end{aligned}$$

We consider the two terms on the right hand side separately. Due to the strict left-locality and the chain rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned}-\mathcal{L}(u_n^{p-2}, u^2\psi^2) =& -\mathcal{L}(u_n^{p-2}, u_n^2\psi^2)\\ =& (2-p)\mathcal{L}(u_n, u_n^{p-1}\psi^2)\\ =& \frac{2(2-p)}{p}\mathcal{L}(u_n^{p/2}, u_n^{p/2}\psi^2)\\ =& \frac{2-p}{p}\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{skew}}(u_n^p\psi^2, 1) + \frac{2-p}{p}\mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{skew}}(u_n^{p/2}, u_n^{p/2}\psi^2).\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by the product rule,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}(u^2u_n^{p-2}, \psi^2) =& \mathcal{R}(u^2u_n^{p-2}, \psi^2) + \mathcal{R}(uu_n^{\frac{p-2}{2}}\psi^2, uu_n^{\frac{p-2}{2}}) + \mathcal{L}(uu_n^{\frac{p-2}{2}}, uu_n^{\frac{p-2}{2}}\psi^2)\\ =& \mathcal{E}_*^{\mathrm{skew}}(uu_n^{\frac{p-2}{2}}, uu_n^{\frac{p-2}{2}}\psi^2).\end{aligned}$$

☐

1.4 Assumptions on the forms

In this section, we consider families of time-dependent forms each of which is of the type introduced in Assumption 0.

For every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, let $(\mathcal{E}_t, \mathcal{F})$ be a (possibly non-symmetric) local bilinear form. Throughout, we assume further that for every $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ the map $t \mapsto \mathcal{E}_t(f,g)$ is measurable and that, for each t, $\mathcal{E}_t$ satisfies the structural hypotheses introduced in Assumption 0. In particular, for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{s}}_t(f,g) = \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{sym}}_t(f,g) - \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{sym}}_t(fg,1),$$

$f, g \in \mathcal{F}$, $fg \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}$ extends to $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F}$ as a symmetric regular, strictly local Dirichlet form with domain $\mathcal{F}$ and energy measure Γ_t.

Assumption 1. *(i) There is a constant $C_1 \in (0,\infty)$ so that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $f, g \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{c}}(X)$,*

$$C_1^{-1} \int f^2 d\Gamma(g,g) \le \int f^2 d\Gamma_t(g,g) \le C_1 \int f^2 d\Gamma(g,g),$$

where Γ_t is the energy measure of $\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{s}}_t$.

(ii) There are constants $C_2, C_3 \in [0,\infty)$ so that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $f \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{c}}(X)$,

$$|\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{sym}}_t(f^2,1)| \le 2 \left(\int f^2 d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(C_2 \int d\Gamma(f,f) + C_3 \int f^2 d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

(iii) There are constants $C_4, C_5 \in [0,\infty)$ such that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $f, g \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{c}}(X)$,

$$\left|\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{skew}}_t(f, fg^2)\right| \le 2 \left(\int f^2 d\Gamma(g,g) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(C_4 \int g^2 d\Gamma(f,f) + C_5 \int f^2 g^2 d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Assumption 2. *There are constants $C_6, C_7 \in [0,\infty)$ such that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{skew}}_t(f, f^{-1}g^2)\right| \le{}& 2 \left(\int d\Gamma(g,g) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(C_6 \int g^2 d\Gamma(\log f, \log f) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &+ 2 \left(\int d\Gamma(g,g) + \int g^2 d\Gamma(\log f, \log f) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(C_7 \int g^2 d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $g \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}} \cap L^\infty(X)$ and all $0 \le f \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}$ with $f + f^{-1} \in L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}(X)$.

Remark 1.17. (i) Assumption 1(i) holds if and only if for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $f \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{c}}(X)$,

$$C_1^{-1} \mathcal{E}(f,f) \le \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{s}}_t(f,f) \le C_1 \mathcal{E}(f,f).$$

See, e.g., [22].

(ii) A consequence of Assumption 1 is that

$$\mathcal{E}_t(f,f) = \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{s}}_t(f,f) + \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{sym}}_t(f^2,1) \ge -\alpha \int f^2 d\mu,$$

where $\alpha = \big(4C_1C_2 + C_3/(C_1C_2)\big)$ if $C_2 > 0$ and $\alpha = 2C_3$ if $C_2 = 0$, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $f \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{c}}(X)$. Hence, the form $\mathcal{E}_t(f,g) + \alpha \int fg d\mu$ is a coercive closed form with domain $\mathcal{F}$. Further, this form (hence also $\mathcal{E}_t$) preserves positivity (i.e., the associated semigroup preserves positivity). See [21].

(iii) The forms $\mathcal{E}_t$ satisfy the above assumptions if and only if the adjoint forms $\mathcal{E}_t^*(f,g) := \mathcal{E}_t(g,f)$ satisfy them.

(iv) If Assumption 1(iii) is satisfied with $C_4 = 0$, then Assumption 2 is satisfied with $C_6 = 0$. To see this, apply Assumption 1(iv) to $\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(f, f^{-1}g^2) = \mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(f, f(f^{-1}g)^2)$.

(v) Assumptions 1 and 2 are satisfied by the classical forms on Euclidean space associated with Example 1.12 when all coefficients are bounded. The constants C_4, C_6 can be taken to be equal to 0 only if $(a_{i,j})$ is symmetric, and C_2, C_5, C_7 can be taken to be equal to 0 only if $b_i = d_i = 0$ for all i (i.e., if there is no drift term).

Remark 1.18. Let $\psi \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}(X) \cap L^\infty(X)$, and $0 \neq u \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(X)$ with $u + u^{-1} \in L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}(X)$. Let $0 \neq p \in \mathbb{R}$. Then it follows from Assumption 1, Lemma 1.15 and Lemma 1.16 that there is a constant $k \geq 1$ such that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1-p}{2}\mathcal{E}_t(u, u^{p-1}\psi^2) \leq & k \int u^p d\Gamma(\psi,\psi) - \frac{1}{k}\frac{(1-p)^2}{p^2}\int \psi^2 d\Gamma(u^{p/2}, u^{p/2}) \\ & + k(p^2+1)\int u^p \psi^2 d\mu.\end{aligned}$$

This is the strong uniform parabolicity condition (SUP) in [35] except for the zero order term $(p^2+1)\int u^p\psi^2 d\mu$. Note that a first order term in the non-symmetric form $\mathcal{E}_t$ creates the factor (p^2+1), rather than $\pm(p-1)$ as was claimed in [35].

In addition, Assumption 2 is the needed replacement for (SUP) when $p = 0$.

Definition 1.19. *Suppose* Assumption 1 *is satisfied.*

$$D(L_t) = \{f \in \mathcal{F} : g \mapsto \mathcal{E}_t(f,g) \textit{ is continuous w.r.t. } \|\cdot\|_{L^2(X)} \textit{ on } \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}(X)\}.$$

For $f \in D(L_t)$, let $L_t f$ be the unique element in $L^2(X)$ such that

$$-\int L_t f g d\mu = \mathcal{E}_t(f,g) \quad \textit{for all } g \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}(X).$$

Then we say that $(L_t, D(L_t))$ is the infinitesimal generator of $(\mathcal{E}_t, \mathcal{F})$ on X.

See, e.g., [6, Section IV.2],[20]. Note that, by Remark 1.17(ii), for each fixed t, the semigroup generated by L_t is positivity preserving.

In the next subsection, we will need the following Lemma (as well as simple variants that are omitted).

Lemma 1.20. *Suppose* Assumption 1 *is satisfied. Let* $1 \neq p \in \mathbb{R}$. *Let* $\psi \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}(X) \cap L^\infty(X)$ *and* $0 \leq u \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(X)$. *Suppose* u *is locally bounded. Then for any* $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{E}_t(\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\psi^2)| \leq & \frac{2}{k}\int u_\varepsilon^p d\Gamma(\psi,\psi) + \frac{2}{k}\frac{(p-1)^2}{4}\int \psi^2 u_\varepsilon^{p-2} d\Gamma(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon) \\ & + 2(C_2 + C_3^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_5)k \int u_\varepsilon^p \psi^2 d\mu.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Observe that

$$|\mathcal{E}_t(\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\psi^2)| = \varepsilon|\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(1, u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\psi^2) + \mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{sym}}(1, u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\psi^2)|.$$

We apply Assumption 1(iii) with $f = 1$ and $g = u_\varepsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2}}\psi$.

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon|\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(1, u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\psi^2)| \leq & 2\left(\int \varepsilon d\Gamma(u_\varepsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2}}\psi, u_\varepsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2}}\psi)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(C_5\int \varepsilon u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\psi^2 d\mu\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \leq & \frac{2}{k}\int \varepsilon u_\varepsilon^{p-1} d\Gamma(\psi,\psi) + \frac{2}{k}\int \varepsilon\psi^2 d\Gamma(u_\varepsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2}}, u_\varepsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2}}) \\ & + kC_5\int \varepsilon u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\psi^2 d\mu \\ \leq & \frac{2}{k}\int u_\varepsilon^p d\Gamma(\psi,\psi) + \frac{2}{k}\frac{(p-1)^2}{4}\int \psi^2 u_\varepsilon^{p-2} d\Gamma(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon) \\ & + kC_5\int u_\varepsilon^p\psi^2 d\mu,\end{aligned}$$

for any $k > 0$. Here we used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (1.1), the chain rule for Γ and the fact that $\varepsilon \leq u_\varepsilon$.

Next, we apply Assumption 1(ii) with $f = u_\varepsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2}}\psi$.

$$\begin{aligned}& \varepsilon|\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{sym}}(1, u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\psi^2)| \\ \leq & 2\left(\int \varepsilon u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\psi^2 d\mu\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(C_2\int \varepsilon\, d\Gamma(u_\varepsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2}}\psi, u_\varepsilon^{\frac{p-1}{2}}\psi) + C_3\int \varepsilon u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\psi^2 d\mu\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.\end{aligned}$$

Now the right hand side can be estimated using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (1.1), the chain rule for Γ and the fact that $\varepsilon \leq u_\varepsilon$. □

1.5 Local weak solutions

For a time interval I and a Hilbert space H, let $L^2(I \to H)$ be the Hilbert space of those functions $v : I \to H$ such that

$$\|v\|_{L^2(I\to H)} = \left(\int_I \|v(t)\|_H^2\, dt\right)^{1/2} < \infty.$$

We say that a function $v \in L^2(I \to H)$ has a distributional time-derivative that can be represented by a function in $L^2(I \to H)$, if there exists $v' \in L^2(I \to H)$ such that for all smooth compactly supported functions $\phi : I \to H$ we have

$$\int \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\phi(t), v(t) \right)_H dt = -\int (v'(t), \phi(t))_H \, dt.$$

Let $W^1(I \to H) \subset L^2(I \to H)$ be the Hilbert space of those functions $v : I \to H$ in $L^2(I \to H)$ whose distributional time derivative v' can be represented by functions in $L^2(I \to H)$, equipped with the norm

$$\|v\|_{W^1(I\to H)} = \left(\int_I \|v(t)\|_H^2 + \|v'(t)\|_H^2 \, dt \right)^{1/2} < \infty.$$

Cf. [19, 29].

Let

$$\mathcal{F}(I \times X) = L^2(I \to \mathcal{F}) \cap W^1(I \to \mathcal{F}'),$$

where $\mathcal{F}'$ denotes the dual space of $\mathcal{F}$. We note that it is well known (and easy to see since $L^2(X, d\mu)$ is separable) that $L^2(I \to L^2(X, d\mu))$ can be identified with $L^2(I \times X, dt \times d\mu)$. Indeed, continuous functions with compact support in $I \times X$ are dense in both spaces and the two norms coincide on these functions.

We recall the following fact from [29, Lemma 10.4],

$$L^2(I \to \mathcal{F}) \cap W^1(I \to \mathcal{F}') \subset C(\bar{I} \to L^2(X, \mu)).$$

Therefore, a function $u \in \mathcal{F}(I \times X)$ can be considered as a continuous path $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ in $L^2(X, \mu)$.

Let $U \subset X$ be open. Let

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(I \times U)$$

be the set of all functions $u : I \times U \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for any open interval J that is relatively compact in I, and any open subset A relatively compact in U, there exists a function $u^\sharp \in \mathcal{F}(I \times U)$ such that $u^\sharp = u$ a.e. in $J \times A$.

Let

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}(I \times U) = \{u \in \mathcal{F}(I \times U) : \text{There is a compact set } K \subset U \text{ that contains the supports of } u(t, \cdot) \text{ for a.e. } t \in I\}.$$

Definition 1.21. *Let I be an open interval and U open. Set $Q = I \times U$. A function $u : Q \to \mathbb{R}$ is a* local weak solution *of the heat equation $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u = L_t u$ in Q, if*

(i) $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(Q)$,

(ii) For any open interval J relatively compact in I,

$$\forall \phi \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}(Q), \; \int_J \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial t}u, \phi \right\rangle_{\mathcal{F}', \mathcal{F}} dt + \int_J \mathcal{E}_t(u(t, \cdot), \phi(t, \cdot)) dt = 0. \qquad (1.5)$$

Remark 1.22. We will abuse notation in writing $\int \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u\phi \, d\mu$ for the pairing $\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u, \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{F}', \mathcal{F}}$.

Definition 1.23. *Let I be an open interval and $U \subset X$ open. Set $Q = I \times U$. A function $u : Q \to \mathbb{R}$ is a* local weak subsolution *of $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} u = L_t u$ in Q, if*

(i) $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(Q)$,

(ii) For any open interval J relatively compact in I,

$$\forall \phi \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}(Q), \phi \geq 0, \quad \int_J \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u, \phi \right\rangle_{\mathcal{F}', \mathcal{F}} dtdt + \int_J \mathcal{E}_t(u(t,\cdot), \phi(t,\cdot)) dt \leq 0. \tag{1.6}$$

We also write $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} u \leq L_t u$ weakly in Q to indicate that a function u is a local weak subsolution in Q.

A function u is called a local weak supersolution *if $-u$ is a local weak subsolution.*

Remark 1.24. If u is a local weak solution in Q then $|u|$ is a (non-negative) local weak subsolution in Q.

Let $L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(I \to \mathcal{F})$ be the space of all functions $u : I \to \mathcal{F}$ such that for any open interval J relatively compact in I, and any open subset A relatively compact in U, there exists a function $u^\natural \in L^2(I \to \mathcal{F})$ such that $u^\natural = u$ a.e. in $J \times A$.

Lemma 1.25. *Suppose that for any compact set $K \subset U$ there exists a cut-off function $\psi \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $0 \leq \psi \leq 1$, $\psi = 1$ on K, ψ has compact support in U, and $\psi f \in \mathcal{F}$ for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$. A function $u : I \to \mathcal{F}$ is a local weak solution of $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} u = L_t u$ on $Q = I \times U$ if and only if*

(i) $u \in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(I \to \mathcal{F})$,

(ii)

$$-\int_I \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \phi, u \right\rangle_{\mathcal{F}', \mathcal{F}} dt + \int_I \mathcal{E}_t(u(t,\cdot), \phi(t,\cdot)) dt = 0, \tag{1.7}$$

for all $\phi \in \mathcal{F}(Q)$ with compact support in $I \times U$.

Proof. See [7, Lemma 5.1]. □

Remark 1.26. Assumptions A1-A2 of Section 2.1 imply existence of cut-off functions as needed in Lemme 1.25.

1.6 Estimates for subsolutions and supersolutions

Let d be a metric on X and assume that open balls $B(x,r) = \{y \in X : d(x,y) < r\}$ are relatively compact.

Fix a parameter $\tau > 0$. Let $B = B(x,r) \subset X$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$. For $\sigma \in (0,1)$, set

$$\begin{aligned} I_\sigma &= (s - \sigma\tau r^2, s) \\ I_\sigma^+ &= (s - \tau r^2, s - \tau r^2 + \sigma\tau r^2) \\ Q &= Q(\tau, x, s, r) = (s - \tau r^2, s) \times B(x,r) \\ Q_\sigma^- &= (s - \sigma\tau r^2, s) \times B(x, \sigma r). \\ Q_\sigma^+ &= (s - \tau r^2, s - \tau r^2 + \sigma\tau r^2) \times B(x, \sigma r). \end{aligned}$$

Let $0 < \sigma' < \sigma < 1$ and $\omega = \sigma - \sigma'$. Let $\psi \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}(B)$ be such that $0 \le \psi \le 1$, $\mathrm{supp}(\psi) \subset \sigma B$, $\psi = 1$ in $\sigma' B$, and $d\Gamma(\psi,\psi) \le c\, d\mu$ for some $c \in (0,\infty)$. Let χ be a smooth function of the time variable t such that $0 \le \chi \le 1$, $\chi = 0$ in $(-\infty, s - \sigma\tau r^2)$, $\chi = 1$ in $(s - \sigma'\tau r^2, \infty)$ and $0 \le \chi' \le 2/(\omega\tau r^2)$. Let $d\bar{\mu} = d\mu \times dt$. Recall that for $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(X)$ we set $u_n = u_{\varepsilon,n} = (u + \varepsilon) \wedge n$.

Lemma 1.27. *Suppose* Assumption 1 *is satisfied. Let* $p \ge 2$. *Let* $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(Q)$ *be a non-negative subsolution of the heat equation for* L_t *in* Q, *that is,* $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} u \le L_t u$ *weakly in* Q. *Suppose* $\psi u^{p/2} \in L^2(I_\sigma \to L^2(B))$. *Then there are* $a_1 \in (0,1)$, $A_1, A_2 \in [0,\infty)$ *depending on* C_1 - C_5 *such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{t \in I_{\sigma'}} \int u^p \psi^2 d\mu + a_1 \int_{I_{\sigma'}} \int \psi^2 d\Gamma(u^{p/2}, u^{p/2}) dt \\ &\le A_1 (p^2 + 1) \int_{Q_\sigma^-} u^p d\Gamma(\psi,\psi) dt \\ &\quad + \left(A_2 (C_2 + C_3 + C_5) + \frac{2}{\omega\tau r^2} \right) (p^2 + 1) \int_{Q_\sigma^-} u^p \psi^2 d\mu\, dt. \end{aligned} \tag{1.8}$$

Proof. We follow [1]. In this proof we consider only non-negative powers of u_n, hence we may let $u_n = u_{n,0}$. Let

$$\mathcal{H}(u) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{p} u^2 u_n^{p-2} & \text{, if } u \le n \\ \frac{1}{2} u^2 u_n^{p-2} & \text{, if } u > n. \end{cases}$$

Since $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} u \le L_t u$ weakly in Q, we have for any $t_0 \in I_{\sigma'}$ and $J = (s - \frac{1+\sigma}{2}\tau r^2, t_0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_J \int \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \big(\chi \mathcal{H}(u) \psi^2 \big) d\mu\, dt &= \int_J \int \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} u u_n^{p-2} \chi \psi^2 d\mu\, dt + \int_J \int \chi' \mathcal{H}(u) \psi^2 d\mu\, dt \\ &\le - \int_J \mathcal{E}_t(u, u u_n^{p-2} \chi \psi^2) dt + \int_J \int \chi' \mathcal{H}(u) \psi^2 d\mu\, dt \\ &\le - \int_J \mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{s}}(u, u u_n^{p-2} \chi \psi^2) dt - \int_J \mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(u, u u_n^{p-2} \chi \psi^2) dt \end{aligned} \tag{1.9}$$

$$- \int_J \mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{sym}}(u^2 u_n^{p-2}\chi\psi^2, 1)dt + \int_J \int \frac{\chi'}{2} u^2 u_n^{p-2}\psi^2 d\mu\, dt.$$

By Lemma 1.15 and Assumption 1(i), we have for any $k_1 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&- \mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{s}}(u, uu_n^{p-2}\chi\psi^2) \\
\le& \frac{4k_1}{p-1}\int u^2 u_n^{p-2}\chi d\Gamma_t(\psi,\psi) + \frac{p-1}{k_1}\int u_n^{p-2}\chi\psi^2 d\Gamma_t(u,u) \\
&- (p-2)\int u_n^{p-2}\chi\psi^2 d\Gamma_t(u_n,u_n) - \int u_n^{p-2}\chi\psi^2 d\Gamma_t(u,u) \\
\le& \frac{4k_1 C_1}{p-1}\int u^2 u_n^{p-2}\chi d\Gamma(\psi,\psi) + \frac{(p-1)C_1}{k_1}\int u_n^{p-2}\chi\psi^2 d\Gamma(u,u) \\
&- (p-2)C_1^{-1}\int u_n^{p-2}\chi\psi^2 d\Gamma(u_n,u_n) - \int C_1^{-1} u_n^{p-2}\chi\psi^2 d\Gamma(u,u).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 1.16 and Assumption 1(iii), we have for any k_2, k_3, $k_4 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&- \mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(u, uu_n^{p-2}\chi\psi^2) \\
=& - \mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(uu_n^{\frac{p-2}{2}}, uu_n^{\frac{p-2}{2}}\chi\psi^2) - \frac{2-p}{p}\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(u_n^{p/2}, u_n^{p/2}\chi\psi^2) \\
&- \frac{2-p}{p}\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(u_n^{p}\chi\psi^2, 1) \\
\le& k_2 \int u^2 u_n^{p-2}\chi d\Gamma(\psi,\psi) + \left(k_3\frac{(2-p)^2}{p^2} + \frac{2}{k_4}\right)\int u_n^p \chi d\Gamma(\psi,\psi) \\
&+ \frac{C_4}{k_2}\int \psi^2\chi d\Gamma(uu_n^{\frac{p-2}{2}}, uu_n^{\frac{p-2}{2}}) + \left(\frac{C_4}{k_3} + \frac{2}{k_4}\right)\int \psi^2\chi d\Gamma(u_n^{p/2}, u_n^{p/2}) \\
&+ \frac{C_5}{k_2}\int u^2 u_n^{p-2}\psi^2\chi d\mu + \left(\frac{C_5}{k_3} + C_5 k_4\frac{(2-p)^2}{p^2}\right)\int u_n^p\psi^2\chi d\mu.
\end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 1(ii), we have for any $k_5 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
-\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{sym}}(u^2 u_n^{p-2}\chi\psi^2, 1) \le& \frac{2}{k_5}\int u^2 u_n^{p-2}\chi d\Gamma(\psi,\psi) + \frac{2}{k_5}\int \psi^2\chi d\Gamma(uu_n^{\frac{p-2}{2}}, uu_n^{\frac{p-2}{2}}) \\
&+ (C_2 k_5 + 2C_3)\int u_2 u_n^{p-2}\psi^2\chi d\mu.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, inequality (1.9) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\sup_{t\in I_{\sigma'}}\int \mathcal{H}(u)\psi^2 d\mu + \frac{p-2}{2C_1}\int_{I_{\sigma'}}\int \psi^2 u_n^{p-2} d\Gamma(u_n,u_n)dt \\
&+ \frac{1}{2C_1}\int_{I_{\sigma'}}\int u_n^{p-2}\psi^2 d\Gamma(u,u)dt \\
\le& \left(\frac{4k_1 C_1}{p-1} + k_2 + \frac{2}{k_5}\right)\int_{I_\sigma}\int u^2 u_n^{p-2} d\Gamma(\psi,\psi)dt
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\left(k_3\frac{(2-p)^2}{p^2}+\frac{2}{k_4}\right)\int_{I_\sigma}\int u_n^p d\Gamma(\psi,\psi)dt\\
&+\frac{(p-1)C_1}{k_1}\int_{I_\sigma}\int \psi^2 u_n^{p-2}d\Gamma(u,u)dt\\
&+\left(\frac{C_4}{k_2}+\frac{2}{k_5}\right)\int_{I_\sigma}\int \psi^2 d\Gamma(uu_n^{\frac{p-2}{2}},uu_n^{\frac{p-2}{2}})dt\\
&+\left(\frac{C_4}{k_3}+\frac{2}{k_4}\right)\int_{I_\sigma}\int \psi^2 d\Gamma(u_n^{p/2},u_n^{p/2})dt\\
&+\left(\frac{C_5}{k_2}+C_2k_5+2C_3+\frac{\chi'}{2}\right)\int_{I_\sigma}\int u^2u_n^{p-2}\psi^2 d\bar{\mu}\\
&+\left(\frac{C_5}{k_3}+C_5k_4\frac{(2-p)^2}{p^2}\right)\int_{I_\sigma}\int u_n^p\psi^2 d\bar{\mu}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Letting n tend to infinity, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{t\in I_{\sigma'}}\frac{1}{2p}\int u^p\psi^2d\mu+\frac{p-1}{2C_1}\int_{I_{\sigma'}}\int\psi^2u^{p-2}d\Gamma(u,u)dt\\
&\le\left(\frac{4k_1C_1}{p-1}+k_2+\frac{2}{k_5}+k_3\frac{(2-p)^2}{p^2}+\frac{2}{k_4}\right)\int_{I_\sigma}\int u^pd\Gamma(\psi,\psi)dt\\
&+\left(\frac{(p-1)C_1}{k_1}+\left(\frac{C_4}{k_2}+\frac{2}{k_5}+\frac{C_4}{k_3}+\frac{2}{k_4}\right)\frac{p^2}{4}\right)\int_{I_\sigma}\int\psi^2u^{p-2}d\Gamma(u,u)dt\\
&+\left(\frac{C_5}{k_3}+C_5k_4\frac{(2-p)^2}{p^2}+\frac{C_5}{k_2}+C_2k_5+2C_3+\frac{1}{\omega\tau r^2}\right)\int_{I_\sigma}\int\psi^2u^pd\bar{\mu}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Appropriate choices of k_1,k_2,k_3,k_4,k_5 finish the proof. □

Lemma 1.28. *Suppose* Assumption 1 *is satisfied. Let $p\in(1+\eta,2]$ for some small $\eta>0$. Let $u\in\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}(Q)$ be a non-negative subsolution of the heat equation for L_t in Q, that is, $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u\le L_tu$ weakly in Q. Suppose that u is locally bounded. Then there are $a_1\in(0,1)$, $A_1,A_2,A_3\in[0,\infty)$ depending on C_1 - C_5 and η such that*

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{t\in I_{\sigma'}}\int u^p\psi^2d\mu+a_1\int_{I_{\sigma'}}\int\psi^2d\Gamma(u^{p/2},u^{p/2})dt\\
&\le A_1(p^2+1)\int_{Q_\sigma^-}u^pd\Gamma(\psi,\psi)dt\\
&\quad+\left(A_2(C_2+C_3+C_3^{\frac{1}{2}}+C_5)+\frac{A_3}{\omega\tau r^2}\right)(p^2+1)\int_{Q_\sigma^-}u^p\psi^2d\mu\,dt. \qquad (1.10)
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. We follow [1]. Since $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u\le L_tu$ weakly in Q, we have for any $t_0\in I_{\sigma'}$, $J=(s-\frac{1+\sigma}{2}\tau r^2,t_0)$,

$$
\frac{1}{p}\int_J\int\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(u_\varepsilon^p\chi\psi^2)d\mu\,dt=\int_J\int\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\chi\psi^2d\mu\,dt+\int_J\int\frac{\chi'}{p}u_\varepsilon^p\psi^2d\mu\,dt
$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\le -\int_J \mathcal{E}_t(u, u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\chi\psi^2)dt + \int_J\int \frac{\chi'}{p}u_\varepsilon^p\psi^2 d\mu\, dt\\
&\le -\int_J \mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{s}}(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\chi\psi^2)dt - \int_J \mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{sym}}(u_\varepsilon^p\chi\psi^2, 1)dt\\
&\quad - \int_J \mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\chi\psi^2)dt + \int_J\int \frac{\chi'}{p}u_\varepsilon^p\psi^2 d\mu\, dt\\
&\quad + \int_J \mathcal{E}_t(\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\chi\psi^2)dt. \qquad (1.11)
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 1.15 and Assumption 1(i), we have for any $k_1 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&- \mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{s}}(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\chi\psi^2)\\
&\le \frac{4k_1}{p-1}\int u_\varepsilon^p \chi d\Gamma_t(\psi,\psi) + \frac{p-1}{k_1}\int u_\varepsilon^{p-2}\chi\psi^2 d\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon)\\
&\quad - (p-1)\int u_\varepsilon^{p-2}\chi\psi^2 d\Gamma_t(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon)\\
&\le \frac{4k_1C_1}{p-1}\int u_\varepsilon^p \chi d\Gamma(\psi,\psi) + \frac{(p-1)C_1}{k_1}\int u_\varepsilon^{p-2}\chi\psi^2 d\Gamma(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon)\\
&\quad - (p-1)C_1^{-1}\int u_\varepsilon^{p-2}\chi\psi^2 d\Gamma(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 1(ii), we have for any $k_2 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{sym}}(u_\varepsilon^p\chi\psi^2, 1)| \le& \frac{2}{k_2}\int u_\varepsilon^p\chi d\Gamma(\psi,\psi) + \frac{p^2}{2k_2}\int \psi^2 u_\varepsilon^{p-2}\chi d\Gamma(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon)\\
&+ (C_2k_2 + 2C_3)\int u_\varepsilon^p\chi\psi^2 d\mu.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 1.16 and Assumption 1(iii), we have for any k_3, $k_4 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&- \mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\chi\psi^2)\\
&= -\frac{2}{p}\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(u_\varepsilon^{p/2}, u_\varepsilon^{p/2}\chi\psi^2) - \frac{2-p}{p}\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(u_\varepsilon^p\chi\psi^2, 1)\\
&\le \left(k_3\frac{4}{p^2} + \frac{2}{k_4}\right)\int u_\varepsilon^p\chi d\Gamma(\psi,\psi) + \left(\frac{C_4}{k_3} + \frac{2}{k_4}\right)\int \psi^2\chi d\Gamma(u_\varepsilon^{p/2}, u_\varepsilon^{p/2})\\
&\quad + \left(\frac{C_5}{k_3} + C_5k_4\frac{(2-p)^2}{p^2}\right)\int u_\varepsilon^p\psi^2\chi d\mu.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 1.20, we have for any $k_5 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{E}_t(\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\psi^2)| \le& \frac{2}{k_5}\int u_\varepsilon^p d\Gamma(\psi,\psi) + \frac{(p-1)^2}{2k_5}\int \psi^2 u_\varepsilon^{p-2} d\Gamma(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon)\\
&+ (C_2 + C_3^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_5)k_5\int u_\varepsilon^p\psi^2 d\mu.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, inequality (1.11) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{t\in I_{\sigma'}} \int \frac{1}{2p} u_\varepsilon^p \psi^2 d\mu + (p-1)\frac{1}{2C_1}\int_{I_{\sigma'}}\int \psi^2 u_\varepsilon^{p-2} d\Gamma(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon)dt \\
&\leq \left(\frac{4k_1C_1}{p-1} + \frac{2}{k_2} + k_3\frac{4}{p^2} + \frac{2}{k_4} + \frac{2}{k_5}\right)\int_{I_\sigma}\int u_\varepsilon^p d\Gamma(\psi,\psi)dt \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{(p-1)C_1}{k_1} + \frac{p^2}{2k_2} + \frac{p^2C_4}{4k_3} + \frac{p^2}{2k_4} + \frac{(p-1)^2}{2k_5}\right)\int_{I_\sigma}\int \psi^2 u_\varepsilon^{p-2} d\Gamma(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon)dt \\
&\quad + \int_{I_\sigma}\int \left(C' + \frac{2}{p\omega\tau r^2}\right) u_\varepsilon^p \psi^2 d\mu\, dt,
\end{aligned}$$

where $C' = C_2k_2 + 2C_3 + \frac{C_5}{k_3} + C_5k_4\frac{(2-p)^2}{p^2} + (C_2 + C_3^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_5)k_5$. Taking the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and appropriate choices of k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4, k_5 finish the proof. ☐

Lemma 1.29. *Suppose* Assumption 1 *is satisfied. Let* $0 \neq p \in (-\infty, 1-\eta)$ *for some small* $\eta > 0$. *Let* $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}(Q)$ *be a non-negative supersolution of the heat equation for* L_t *in* Q, *that is,* $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u \geq L_t u$ *weakly in* Q. *Suppose that* u *is locally bounded.*

(i) If $p < 0$, *there are* $a_1 \in (0,1)$, $A_1, A_2 \in [0,\infty)$ *depending on* C_1 - C_5 *such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{t\in I_{\sigma'}} \int u_\varepsilon^p \psi^2 d\mu + a_1 \int_{I_{\sigma'}}\int \psi^2 d\Gamma(u_\varepsilon^{p/2}, u_\varepsilon^{p/2})dt \\
&\leq A_1(p^2+1)\int_{Q_\sigma^-} u_\varepsilon^p d\Gamma(\psi,\psi)dt \\
&\quad + \left(A_2(C_2 + C_3 + C_3^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_5) + \frac{2}{\omega\tau r^2}\right)(p^2+1)\int_{Q_\sigma^-} u_\varepsilon^p\psi^2 d\mu\, dt. \qquad (1.12)
\end{aligned}$$

(ii) If $p \in (0, 1-\eta)$, *there are* $a_1 \in (0,1)$, $A_1, A_2 \in [0,\infty)$ *depending on* C_1 - C_5, η *such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{t\in I^+_{\sigma'}} \int u_\varepsilon^p \psi^2 d\mu + a_1 \int_{I^+_{\sigma'}}\int \psi^2 d\Gamma(u_\varepsilon^{p/2}, u_\varepsilon^{p/2})dt \\
&\leq A_1(p^2+1)\int_{Q_\sigma^+} u_\varepsilon^p d\Gamma(\psi,\psi)dt \\
&\quad + \left(A_2(C_2 + C_3 + C_3^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_5) + \frac{2}{\omega\tau r^2}\right)(p^2+1)\int_{Q_\sigma^+} u_\varepsilon^p\psi^2 d\mu\, dt. \qquad (1.13)
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Before we consider the cases $p > 0$ and $p \in (0, 1-\eta)$ separately, we first show some estimates that hold for any p.

Applying Assumption 1(iii), we obtain that for any $k_1, k_2, k_3 > 0$,

$$2|\mathcal{E}_t^{\text{skew}}(u_\varepsilon^{p/2}, u_\varepsilon^{p/2}\chi\psi^2)| + |2-p||\mathcal{E}_t^{\text{skew}}(u_\varepsilon^p\chi\psi^2, 1)| + |p||\mathcal{E}_t^{\text{skew}}(\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\chi\psi^2)|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left(4k_1 + \frac{2}{k_2} + \frac{2}{k_3}\right) \int u_\varepsilon^p \chi d\Gamma(\psi,\psi) \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{C_4}{k_1} + \frac{2}{k_2} + \frac{2}{k_3}\frac{(p-1)^2}{p^2}\right) \int \psi^2 \chi d\Gamma(u_\varepsilon^{p/2}, u_\varepsilon^{p/2}) \\
&\quad + C_5 \left(\frac{1}{k_1} + |2-p|^2 k_2 + |p|^2 k_3\right) \int u_\varepsilon^p \chi \psi^2 d\mu.
\end{aligned} \tag{1.14}$$

By Assumption 1(ii), we have for any $k_4 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|p||\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{sym}}(u u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\chi\psi^2, 1)| \leq & \frac{2}{k_4} \int u_\varepsilon^p \chi d\Gamma(\psi,\psi) \\
& + \frac{2}{k_4}\frac{(p-1)^2}{p^2} \int \psi^2 \chi d\Gamma(u_\varepsilon^{p/2}, u_\varepsilon^{p/2}) \\
& + (C_2 k_4 p^2 + 2C_3|p|) \int u_\varepsilon^p \chi \psi^2 d\mu.
\end{aligned} \tag{1.15}$$

By Lemma 1.15 and by Assumption 1(i), we have for any $k_5 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|p|\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{s}}(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\chi\psi^2) \leq & 4k_5 C_1 \int u_\varepsilon^p \chi d\Gamma(\psi,\psi) \\
& - \left(1 - \frac{1}{k_5}\right) \frac{|p-1|}{|p|} \frac{4}{C_1} \int \psi^2 \chi d\Gamma(u_\varepsilon^{p/2}, u_\varepsilon^{p/2}).
\end{aligned} \tag{1.16}$$

Now we consider the case $p < 0$. Since $-\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u \leq -L_t u$ and by Lemma 1.16 and Assumption 1, we have for any $t_0 \in I_{\sigma'}$ and $J = (s - \frac{1+\sigma}{2}\tau r^2, t_0)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_J \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int u_\varepsilon^p \chi \psi^2 d\mu\right) dt \\
&= p \int_J \int \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} u_\varepsilon^{p-1} \chi \psi^2 d\mu \, dt + \int \chi' u_\varepsilon^p \psi^2 d\mu \, dt \\
&\leq p \int_J \mathcal{E}(u, u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\chi\psi^2) dt + \int_J \int \chi' u_\varepsilon^p \psi^2 d\mu \, dt \\
&\leq |p| \int_J |\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{s}}(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\chi\psi^2)| dt + \int_J \int \chi' u_\varepsilon^p \psi^2 d\mu \, dt \\
&\quad + 2 \int_J |\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(u_\varepsilon^{p/2}, u_\varepsilon^{p/2}\chi\psi^2)| dt + |2-p| \int_J |\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(u_\varepsilon^p \chi\psi^2, 1)| dt \\
&\quad + |p| \int_J |\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\chi\psi^2)| dt + |p| \int_J |\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{sym}}(u u_\varepsilon^{p-1}\chi\psi^2, 1)| dt.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of (1.12) can now be finished similarly to the proof of Lemma 1.27 and Lemma 1.28, by using the estimates (1.14), (1.15), and (1.16).

Note that the estimates (1.14), (1.15), (1.16) hold in fact for any non-negative function of the time-variable. For the case $p \in (0, 1-\eta)$, let χ be such that $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$, $\chi = 0$ in $(s - (1-\sigma)\tau r^2, \infty)$, $\chi = 1$ in $(-\infty, s - (1-\sigma')\tau r^2)$, and $0 \geq \chi' \geq -2/(\omega\tau r^2)$.

Since $-\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u \leq -L_t u$ and by Lemma 1.16 and Assumption 1, we have for any $t_0 \in I^+_{\sigma'}$ and $J = (t_0, s)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\int_J \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int u_\varepsilon^p \chi \psi^2 d\mu \right) dt \\
=& -p \int_J \int \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} u_\varepsilon^{p-1} \chi \psi^2 d\mu \, dt - \int \chi' u_\varepsilon^p \psi^2 d\mu \, dt \\
\leq& \, p \int_J \mathcal{E}(u, u_\varepsilon^{p-1} \chi \psi^2) dt - \int_J \int \chi' u_\varepsilon^p \psi^2 d\mu \, dt \\
\leq& \, p \int_J \mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{s}}(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon^{p-1} \chi \psi^2) dt - \int_J \int \chi' u_\varepsilon^p \psi^2 d\mu \, dt \\
&+ 2 \int_J |\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(u_\varepsilon^{p/2}, u_\varepsilon^{p/2} \chi \psi^2)| dt + |2-p| \int_J |\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(u_\varepsilon^p \chi \psi^2, 1)| dt \\
&+ p \int_J |\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon^{p-1} \chi \psi^2)| dt + p \int_J |\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{sym}}(u u_\varepsilon^{p-1} \chi \psi^2, 1)| dt.
\end{aligned}
$$

The proof of (1.13) can now be finished similarly to the proof of Lemma 1.27 and Lemma 1.28, by using the estimates (1.14), (1.15), and (1.16). □

2 Parabolic Harnack inequality

2.1 Assumptions on the underlying space

The *intrinsic distance* $d := d_{\mathcal{E}}$ induced by $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is defined as

$$
d_{\mathcal{E}}(x, y) := \sup \big\{ f(x) - f(y) : f \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(X) \cap C(X), \, d\Gamma(f, f) \leq d\mu \big\},
$$

for all $x, y \in X$, where $C(X)$ is the space of continuous functions on X. Consider the following properties of the intrinsic distance that may or may not be satisfied. They are discussed in [36, 34].

The intrinsic distance d is finite everywhere, continuous, and defines the original topology of X. (A1)

(X, d) is a complete metric space. (A2)

Note that if (A1) holds true, then (A2) is by [36, Theorem 2] equivalent to

$$
\forall x \in X, r > 0, \text{ the open ball } B(x, r) \text{ is relatively compact in } (X, d). \quad \text{(A2')}
$$

Moreover, (A1)-(A2) imply that (X, d) is a geodesic space, i.e. any two points in X can be connected by a minimal geodesic in X. See [36, Theorem 1]. If (A1) and (A2) hold true, then by [34, Proposition 1],

$$
d_{\mathcal{E}}(x, y) := \sup \big\{ f(x) - f(y) : f \in \mathcal{F} \cap C_{\mathrm{c}}(X), \, d\Gamma(f, f) \leq d\mu \big\}, \quad x, y \in X.
$$

It is sometimes sufficient to consider property (A2) only on an open, connected subset Y of X, that is,

$$\text{For any ball } B(x,2r) \subset Y, B(x,r) \text{ is relatively compact.} \tag{A2-Y}$$

Note that an open set Y such that $\overline{Y}$ is complete in (X,d) automatically satisfies (A2-Y).

Definition 2.1. *$(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{F})$ satisfies the* volume doubling property *on Y, if there exists a constant $D_Y \in (0,\infty)$ such that for every ball $B(x,2r) \subset Y$,*

$$V(x,2r) \leq D_Y\, V(x,r), \tag{VD}$$

where $V(x,r) = \mu(B(x,r))$ denotes the volume of $B(x,r)$.

Definition 2.2. *$(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{F})$ satisfies the* Poincaré inequality *on Y if there exists a constant $P_Y \in (0,\infty)$ such that for any ball $B(x,2r) \subset Y$,*

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{F},\ \int_{B(x,r)} |f - f_B|^2 d\mu \leq P_Y\, r^2 \int_{B(x,2r)} d\Gamma(f,f), \tag{PI}$$

where $f_B = \frac{1}{V(x,r)} \int_{B(x,r)} f d\mu$ is the mean of f over $B(x,r)$.

Definition 2.3. *$(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{F})$ satisfies the localized* Sobolev inequality *on Y if there exist constants $\nu > 2$ and $S_Y > 0$ such that for any ball $B = B(x,r)$ with $B(x,2r) \subset Y$, we have*

$$\left(\int_B |f|^{\frac{2\nu}{\nu-2}} d\mu\right)^{\frac{\nu-2}{\nu}} \leq S_Y \frac{r^2}{V(x,r)^{2/\nu}} \left(\int_B d\Gamma(f,f) + r^{-2} \int_B f^2 d\mu\right), \tag{2.1}$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}(B)$.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $(X,\mu,\mathcal{E},\mathcal{F})$ be as above and $Y \subset X$. If* (A1), (A2-Y), *volume doubling and Poincaré inequality hold on Y, then the localized Sobolev inequality holds on Y.*

Proof. See [37, Theorem 2.6]. ☐

In what follows we will consider the following assumptions where Y is a fixed open subset of X.

Assumption 3. *The form $(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{F})$ satisfies* (A1), (A2-Y), *and the Sobolev inequality on Y.*

Assumption 4. *The form $(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{F})$ satisfies* (A1), (A2-Y), *volume doubling on Y and the Poincaré inequality on Y.*

Remark 2.5. Assumption 3 implies the volume doubling property on Y. See, e.g., [32, Theorem 5.2.1].

2.2 Mean value estimates

We follow [1] and [32]. In this section we suppose that Assumption 1 holds true and that Assumption 3 is satisfied on the open set Y. We use the notation of Section 1.6. Let $A_2' = A_2(C_2 + C_3 + C_3^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_5)$. Fix a ball $B = B(x, r)$ with $B(x, 2r) \subset Y$. Let ψ be the cut-off function

$$\psi = \max\left\{0, \big(\sigma r - d_{\mathcal{E}}(x, y)\big)/(\omega r)\right\} \wedge 1. \tag{2.2}$$

Then $0 \leq \psi \leq 1$, $\operatorname{supp}(\psi) \subset \sigma B$, $\psi = 1$ in $\sigma' B$, and by [34, Section 4.2] $\psi \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}(B)$ and

$$d\Gamma(\psi, \psi) \leq \frac{4}{(\omega r)^2} d\mu.$$

Theorem 2.6. *Suppose* Assumptions 1 *and* 3 *are satisfied. Let $p > 1 + \eta$ for some small $\eta > 0$. Fix a ball $B = B(x, r)$ with $B(x, 2r) \subset Y$ and $\tau > 1$. Then there exists a constant $A = A(\tau, \nu, \eta, C_1 - C_5)$ such that, for any real s, any $0 < \delta < \delta' \leq 1$, and any non-negative function $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(Q)$ with $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} u \leq L_t u$ weakly in $Q = Q(\tau, x, s, r)$, we have*

$$\sup_{Q_\delta^-}\{u^p\} \leq \frac{A\, S_Y^{\nu/2}[(A_1 + A_2' \tau r^2)(p^2 + 1)]^{1+\nu/2}}{(\delta' - \delta)^{2+\nu} r^2 V(x, r)} \int_{Q_{\delta'}^-} u^p d\bar{\mu}, \tag{2.3}$$

where ν, S_Y are the constants of the localized Sobolev inequality (2.1).

Proof. For simplicity, we assume that $\tau = \delta' = 1$. First, consider the case $p \geq 2$. Let $E(B) = S_Y r^2 V(x, r)^{-2/\nu}$ be the Sobolev constant for the ball B given by (2.1), and set $\beta = \nu/(\nu - 2)$. By the Hölder inequality, we have for any $v \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}(B)$,

$$\int_B v^{2(1+2/\nu)} d\mu \leq \left(\int_B v^{2\beta} d\mu\right)^{1/\beta} \left(\int_B v^2 d\mu\right)^{2/\nu}.$$

So, (2.1) gives

$$\int_B v^{2(1+2/\nu)} d\mu \leq E(B) \left(\int_B d\Gamma(v, v) + r^{-2} \int_B v^2 d\mu\right) \left(\int_B v^2 d\mu\right)^{2/\nu}. \tag{2.4}$$

Let $w = \psi u$. Since u is a local weak solution, $u \in L^2(I \to \mathcal{F})$. Hence, $w \in L^2(I \to \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}(B))$. In particular, for any t, $v = w(t, \cdot)$ is in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}(B)$ and satisfies (2.4). Integrating over $I_{\sigma'}$ and applying Hölder inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{I_{\sigma'}} \int_B w^{2\theta} d\mu dt \leq & E(B) \left(\int_{I_{\sigma'}} \int_B d\Gamma(w, w) dt + r^{-2} \int_{I_{\sigma'}} \int_B w^2 d\mu dt\right) \\ & \sup_{t \in I_{\sigma'}} \left(\int_B w^2 d\mu\right)^{2/\nu},\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

where $\theta = 1 + 2/\nu$. Note that the right hand side is finite by Lemma 1.27. Thus, $w^\theta \in L^2(I_{\sigma'} \to L^2(B))$. Applying Lemma 1.27, we obtain that $w^\theta \in L^2(I_{\sigma''} \to \mathcal{F}_c(B))$ for some $0 < \sigma'' < \sigma$. In particular, $u^\theta \in L^2(I_{\sigma''} \to \mathcal{F}(\sigma'' B))$. Similarly (using a cut-off function that takes the value 1 on σB), one can show that $u^\theta \in L^2(I_\sigma \to \mathcal{F}(\sigma B))$. Hence, $w = \psi u^\theta$ is in $L^2(I_\sigma \to \mathcal{F}_c(B))$ and satisfies (2.5).

By an inductive argument we obtain that, for any $q \geq 1$, $\psi u^{pq/2}$ is in $L^2(I_\sigma \to \mathcal{F}_c(B))$ and satisfies (2.5). Recall that $d\Gamma(\psi, \psi) \leq \frac{4}{(\omega r)^2} d\mu$. Thus,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int\int_{Q^-_{\sigma'}} u^{pq\theta} d\bar{\mu} = \int\int_{Q^-_{\sigma'}} (\psi u^{pq/2})^{2\theta} d\bar{\mu} \\
\leq & E(\sigma B) \left(\int_{I_{\sigma'}} \int_{\sigma B} d\Gamma(\psi u^{pq/2}, \psi u^{pq/2}) dt + r^{-2} \int_{I_{\sigma'}} \int_B \psi^2 u^{pq} d\bar{\mu} \right) \\
& \left(\sup_{t \in I_{\sigma'}} \int_{\sigma B} \psi^2 u^{pq} d\mu \right)^{2/\nu} \\
\leq & E(\sigma B) \left(\frac{Cq^2}{(\omega r)^2} [(A_1 + A_2' r^2)(p^2+1)] \int\int_{Q^-_\sigma} u^{pq} d\bar{\mu} \right)^\theta, \qquad (2.6)
\end{aligned}
$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Observe the different roles of p (which is fixed) and q (which will be absorbed in the constant A^{i+1} below).

Set $\omega_i = (1-\delta)2^{-i}$ so that $\sum_{i=1}^\infty \omega_i = 1 - \delta$. Set also $\sigma_0 = 1$, $\sigma_{i+1} = \sigma_i - \omega_i = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^i \omega_j$. Applying (2.6) with $q = q_i = \theta^i$, $\sigma = \sigma_i$, $\sigma' = \sigma_{i+1}$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int\int_{Q^-_{\sigma_{i+1}}} u^{p\theta^{i+1}} d\bar{\mu} \\
\leq & E(B) \left(A^{i+1} [(1-\delta) r]^{-2} [(A_1 + A_2' r^2)(p^2+1)] \int\int_{Q^-_{\sigma_i}} u^{p\theta^i} d\bar{\mu} \right)^\theta,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the constant A depends on θ. Hence,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left(\int\int_{Q^-_{\sigma_{i+1}}} u^{p\theta^{i+1}} d\bar{\mu} \right)^{\theta^{-1-i}} \\
\leq & E(B)^{\sum \theta^{-1-j}} A^{\sum (j+1)\theta^{-j}} \left([(1-\delta) r]^{-2} [(A_1 + A_2' r^2)(p^2+1)] \right)^{\sum \theta^{-j}} \int\int_Q u^p d\bar{\mu},
\end{aligned}
$$

where all the summations are taken from 0 to i. Letting i tend to infinity, we obtain

$$
\sup_{Q^-_\delta} \{u^p\} \leq E(B)^{\nu/2} \left(A[(1-\delta) r]^{-2-\nu} [(A_1 + A_2' r^2)(p^2+1)]^{1+\nu/2} \right) \|u\|^p_{p,Q}.
$$

As $E(B) = S_Y V(x,r)^{-2/\nu} r^2$, this yields (2.3).

At this stage of the proof, Corollary 2.8 already follows. Thus, in the case $1+\eta < p < 2$ the assertion can be proved similarly, by using Lemma 1.28 and Corollary 2.8. $\square$

Remark 2.7. For $0 < p < 1+\eta$, an estimate similar to (2.3) for subsolutions holds true with constants depending on p. See [32, Theorem 2.2.3, Theorem 5.2.9].

Corollary 2.8. *Any non-negative local weak subsolution u of $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u = L_t u$ on Y is locally bounded.*

Theorem 2.9. *Suppose* Assumptions 1 *and* 3 *are satisfied. Let $p \in (-\infty, 0)$. Fix a ball $B = B(x,r)$ with $B(x,2r) \subset Y$ and let $\tau > 0$. Then there exists a constant $A = A(\tau, \nu, C_1 - C_5)$ such that, for any real s, any $0 < \delta < \delta' \leq 1$, and any non-negative, locally bounded function $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}(Q)$ with $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u \geq L_t u$ weakly in $Q = Q(\tau, x, s, r)$, we have*

$$\sup_{Q_\delta^-}\{u_\varepsilon^p\} \leq \frac{A\, S_Y^{\nu/2}[(A_1 + A_2'\tau r^2)(p^2+1)]^{1+\nu/2}}{(\delta'-\delta)^{2+\nu} r^2 V(x,r)} \int_{Q_{\delta'}^-} u_\varepsilon^p d\bar{\mu}.$$

The above theorem can be proved analogously to the proof of Theorem 2.6, by applying Lemma 1.29 instead of Lemma 1.27.

Theorem 2.10. *Suppose* Assumptions 1 *and* 3 *are satisfied. Fix a ball $B = B(x,r)$ with $B(x,2r) \subset Y$ and let $\tau > 0$. Set $\theta = 1 + 2/\nu$ and fix $p_0 \in (0,\theta)$. Then there exists a constant $A = A(p_0, \tau, \nu, C_1 - C_5)$ such that for any real s, $0 < \delta < \delta' < 1$, $0 < p < p_0/\theta$, and any non-negative, locally bounded function $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}(Q)$ with $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u \geq Lu$ weakly in $Q = Q(\tau, x, s, r)$, we have*

$$\left(\int_{Q_\delta^+} u_\varepsilon^{p_0} d\bar{\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{p_0}} \leq \left[\frac{A\, S_Y^{\nu/2}[(A_1 + A_2'\tau r^2)(p_0^2+1)]^{1+\nu/2}}{(\delta'-\delta)^{2+\nu} r^2 \mu(B)}\right]^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{p_0}} \left(\int_{Q_{\delta'}^+} u_\varepsilon^p d\bar{\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Proof. We follow [32, Theorem 5.2.17]. For simplicity, we assume for the proof that $\tau = \delta' = 1$. Let $0 < p < p_0/\theta$. By Lemma 1.29, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{I_{\sigma'}^+}\left\{\int_B u_\varepsilon^p \psi^2 d\mu\right\} + a_1 \int_{Q_\sigma^+} \psi^2 d\Gamma(u_\varepsilon^{p/2}, u_\varepsilon^{p/2}) dt \\ \leq & A_1(p^2+1)\int_{Q_\sigma^+} u_\varepsilon^p d\Gamma(\psi,\psi)dt + A_2(C_2 + C_3 + C_3^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_5)(p^2+1)\int_{Q_\sigma^+} u_\varepsilon^p \psi^2 d\bar{\mu}.\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of Theorem 2.6 but with the cylinders Q_σ^- replaced by Q_σ^+, we find that for any $0 < \beta < p_0/\theta < 1$,

$$\int_{Q_{\sigma'}^+} u_\varepsilon^{\beta\theta} d\bar{\mu} \leq E(B)\left[\frac{A}{(r\omega)^2}[(A_1 + A_2' r^2)(\beta^2+1)]\int_{Q_\sigma^+} u_\varepsilon^\beta d\bar{\mu}\right]^\theta, \tag{2.7}$$

where $E(B) = S_Y r^2 V(x,r)^{-2/\nu}$.

Define $p_i = p_0\theta^{-i}$. We first prove the claim for these values of p, using the same iteration as in the proof of [32, Theorem 2.2.5]. Set $\sigma_0 = 1$ and $\sigma_{l-1}-\sigma_l = 2^{-l}(1-\delta)$. Fix $i \geq 1$, and apply (2.7) with $\beta = p_i\theta^{j-1}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, i$, $\sigma = \sigma_{i-1}$, $\sigma' = \sigma_i$. This yields for all $j = 1, \dots, i$ (note that A may change from line to line),

$$\int_{Q^+_{\sigma_i}} u_\varepsilon^{p_i\theta^j} d\bar{\mu} \leq E(B) \left[A^j[(1-\delta)r]^{-2}[(A_1 + A_2' r^2)(p_i^2+1)] \int_{Q^+_{\sigma_{i-1}}} u_\varepsilon^{p_i\theta^{j-1}} d\bar{\mu} \right]^\theta .$$

Hence,

$$\int_{Q^+_{\sigma_i}} u_\varepsilon^{p_0} d\bar{\mu} \leq C \left(\int_Q u_\varepsilon^{p_i} d\bar{\mu} \right)^{\theta^i},$$

where

$$C = E(B)^{\sum_{j=0}^{i-1}\theta^j} A^{\sum_{j=0}^{i-1}(i-j)\theta^{j+1}} \left([(1-\delta)r]^{-2}[(A_1 + A_2' r^2)(p_0^2+1)] \right)^{\sum_{j=0}^{i-1}\theta^{j+1}} .$$

Observe that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \theta^j = \frac{\theta^i - 1}{\theta - 1} = (\nu/2)(p_0/p_i - 1),$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} (i-j)\theta^j &= \sum_{j=0}^{i-1}\sum_{k=0}^{j} \theta^k = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{\theta^{j+1}-1}{\theta-1} \leq \theta \frac{\theta^i - 1}{(\theta-1)^2} \\ &\leq (\theta/(\theta-1))^2 \theta^{i-1} \leq (\theta/(\theta-1))^2 (\nu/2)(\theta^i - 1) \\ &\leq (\theta/(\theta-1))^2 (\nu/2)(p_0/p_i - 1), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sigma_i = 1 - \left(\sum_{j=1}^{i} 2^{-j} \right)(1-\delta) > \delta.$$

Thus,

$$\left(\int_{Q^+_\delta} u_\varepsilon^{p_0} d\bar{\mu} \right)^{\frac{1}{p_0}} \leq C' \left(\int_Q u_\varepsilon^{p_i} d\bar{\mu} \right)^{\frac{1}{p_i}},$$

where

$$C' = \left(E(B) A \left([(1-\delta)r]^{-2}[(A_1 + A_2' r^2)(p_0^2+1)] \right)^\theta \right)^{\frac{\nu}{2}\left(\frac{1}{p_i} - \frac{1}{p_0}\right)}$$

To obtain the inequality for any $p \in (0, p_0/\theta)$, see [32, Theorem 2.2.5]. $\square$

2.3 Parabolic Harnack inequality

Suppose that Assumptions 1, 2 and 4 are satisfied.

Lemma 2.11. *Let $\tau > 0$ and $\delta, \eta \in (0,1)$. For any real s, any $B = B(x,r)$ with $B(x,2r) \subset Y$, and any non-negative, locally bounded function $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(Q)$ with $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u \geq L_t u$ weakly in Q, there is a constant c depending on u, τ, δ, η and on an upper bound on r, and constants $A_4, A_5 \in [0,\infty)$ depending on C_1 - C_7 such that for all $a > 0$,*

$$\bar{\mu}(\{(t,z) \in K_+ : \log u_\varepsilon < -a-c\}) \leq (A_4+A_5(C_2+C_3+C_3^{\frac{1}{2}}+C_5+C_7)r^2)r^2\mu(B)a^{-1}$$

and

$$\bar{\mu}(\{(t,z) \in K_- : \log u_\varepsilon > a-c\}) \leq (A_4+A_5(C_2+C_3+C_3^{\frac{1}{2}}+C_5+C_7)r^2)r^2\mu(B)a^{-1},$$

where $K_+ = (s-\eta\tau r^2, s) \times \delta B$ and $K_- = (s-r^2, s-\eta\tau r^2) \times \delta B$.

Proof. For simplicity, assume that $\tau = 1$. By changing δ, we may assume that u is a supersolution in $(s-r^2,s) \times B'$, where B' is a concentric ball larger than B. Let $\psi(z) = \max\{0, (1-d(x,z))/r\} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{c}}(B')$. Note that $\Upsilon(\psi,\psi) := d\Gamma(\psi,\psi)/d\mu$ is bounded. Because of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (1.1) and Assumption 1(i), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{s}}(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon^{-1}\psi^2) &= \int 2\psi d\Gamma_t(\log(u_\varepsilon),\psi) - \int \psi^2 d\Gamma_t(\log(u_\varepsilon),\log(u_\varepsilon)) \\ &\leq k\int d\Gamma(\psi,\psi) - \frac{1}{k}\int \psi^2 d\Gamma(\log(u_\varepsilon),\log(u_\varepsilon)),\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $k > 1$. Hence, applying the chain rule for Γ, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (1.1), Assumptions 1, 2 and Lemma 1.20, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&-\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\int \psi^2 \log u_\varepsilon d\mu = -\int \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} u_\varepsilon^{-1}\psi^2 d\mu \\ &\leq \mathcal{E}_t(u, u_\varepsilon^{-1}\psi^2) \\ &\leq \mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{s}}(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon^{-1}\psi^2) + \mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{skew}}(u_\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon^{-1}\psi^2) + \mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{sym}}(\psi^2,1) - \mathcal{E}_t(\varepsilon, u_\varepsilon^{-1}\psi^2) \\ &\leq k'\int d\Gamma(\psi,\psi) - \frac{1}{k'}\int \psi^2 d\Gamma(\log u_\varepsilon, \log u_\varepsilon) + k'(C_2+C_3+C_3^{\frac{1}{2}}+C_5+C_7)\int \psi^2 d\mu,\end{aligned}$$

for some $k' > 1$. The rest of the proof goes the same way as [32, Proof of Lemma 5.4.1]. □

Fix $\tau > 0$ and $\delta \in (0,1)$, define

$$\begin{aligned}I &= (s-\tau r^2, s) \\ Q_- &= (s-(3+\delta)\tau r^2/4, s-(3-\delta)\tau r^2/4) \times \delta B \\ Q'_- &= (s-\tau r^2, s-(3-\delta)\tau r^2/4) \times \delta B \\ Q_+ &= (s-(1+\delta)\tau r^2/4, s) \times \delta B.\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2.12. *Suppose* Assumptions 1, 2 *and* 4 *are satisfied. Let* $\nu > 2$ *be as in* (2.1) *and* $p_0 \in (0, 1+2/\nu)$. *Then there exists a constant* A *such that, for any real* s, *any* $B = B(x,r)$ *with* $B(x,2r) \subset Y$, *and any locally bounded function* $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(Q)$ *with* $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u \geq L_t u$ *weakly in* Q, *we have*

$$\left(\frac{1}{\mu(Q'_-)}\int_{Q'_-} u^{p_0}\,d\bar{\mu}\right)^{1/p_0} \leq A \inf_{Q_+}\{u\}.$$

The constant A *depends only on* τ, δ, D_Y, P_Y, p_0, C_1-C_7, *and an upper bound on* $(C_2 + C_3 + C_3^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_5 + C_7)r^2$.

Proof. See [32, Theorem 5.4.2]. □

Theorem 2.13. *Suppose* Assumptions 1, 2 *and* 4 *are satisfied. Then the family* $(\mathcal{E}_t, \mathcal{F})$ *satisfies the parabolic Harnack inequality on* Y. *That is, there is a constant* $H_Y = H_Y(\tau, \delta, D_Y, P_Y, C_1 - C_7, (C_2 + C_3 + C_3^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_5 + C_7)r^2)$ *such that for any* $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $B(x,r)$ *with* $B(x,2r) \subset Y$, *and any non-negative local weak solution* $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(Q)$ *of* $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u = L_t u$ *in* Q, *we have*

$$\sup_{Q_-} u \leq H_Y \inf_{Q_+} u.$$

Proof. Follows from Corollary 2.8, Theorem 2.6 and Theorem 2.12. □

Corollary 2.14. *Suppose* Assumptions 1, 2 *and* 4 *are satisfied globally on* $Y = X$ *with* $C_2 = C_3 = C_5 = C_7 = 0$. *Then the family* $(\mathcal{E}_t, \mathcal{F})$ *satisfies a scale-invariant parabolic Harnack inequality on* X. *That is, there is a constant* H *such that for any* $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $B(x,r) \subset X$, *and any non-negative local weak solution* $u \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(Q)$ *of* $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u = L_t u$ *in* Q, *we have*

$$\sup_{Q_-} u \leq H \inf_{Q_+} u.$$

The constant H *depends only on* τ, δ, D_X, P_X, C_1, C_4, C_6.

Remark 2.15. The hypothesis $C_2 = C_3 = C_5 = C_7 = 0$ is satisfied for second-order differential operators with no lower order terms. The second order term may be non-symmetric.

Corollary 2.16. *Suppose* Assumptions 1, 2 *and* 4 *are satisfied. Fix* $\tau > 0$ *and* $\delta \in (0,1)$. *Then there exist* $\beta \in (0,1)$ *and* $H \in (0,\infty)$ *such that for any* $B(x,2r) \subset Y$, *any real* s, *any local weak solution of* $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u = L_t u$ *in* $Q = (s - \tau r^2, s) \times B(x,r)$ *has a continuous representative and satisfies*

$$\sup_{(t,y),(t',y') \in Q_-}\left\{\frac{|u(t,y) - u(t',y')|}{[|t-t'|^{1/2} + d_{\mathcal{E}}(y,y')^{\beta}]}\right\} \leq \frac{H}{r^{\beta}}\sup_{Q}|u|$$

where $Q_- = (s - (3+\delta)\tau r^2/4, s - (3-\delta)\tau r^2/4) \times B(x, \delta r)$. *The constant* H *depends only on* τ, δ, D_Y, P_Y, C_1-C_7 *and an upper bound on* $(C_2 + C_3 + C_3^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_5 + C_7)r^2$.

Proof. See, e.g., [32]. □

3 Applications

In this section, we continue to work under Assumptions 1 and 2 concerning the family of bilinear forms $\mathcal{E}_t$. We also assume that the sector condition holds uniformly in t in the form

$$\forall\, f, g \in \mathcal{F}, \ \ |\mathcal{E}_t(f,g)| \leq C_* \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}} \|g\|_{\mathcal{F}}.$$

In addition, we assume that Assumption 4 is satisfied locally on X, that is, every point $x \in X$ has a neighborhood $Y_x = B(x, r_x)$ where Assumption 4 is satisfied with $Y = Y_x$. Recall from Remark 1.17 that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $f \in \mathcal{F}$, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_t(f,f) = \mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{s}}(f,f) + \mathcal{E}_t^{\mathrm{sym}}(f^2, 1) \geq -\alpha \int f^2 d\mu,$$

where $\alpha = \big(4C_1C_2 + C_3/(C_1C_2)\big)$ if $C_2 > 0$ and $\alpha = 2C_3$ if $C_2 = 0$.

Proposition 3.1. *For every $f \in L^2(X,\mu)$ there exists a unique weak solution u of the initial value problem*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} u = L_t u \quad \text{ on } I \times X, \tag{3.1}$$

$$u(s, \cdot) = f \quad \text{ on } X. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. See [19, Chap. 3, Theorem 4.1 and Remark 4.3]. □

For any $s \leq t$ there exists a unique *transition operator*

$$T_t^s : L^2(X,\mu) \to L^2(X,\mu)$$

associated with $L_t - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ such that for every $f \in L^2(X,\mu)$ the unique solution u of (3.1)-(3.2) is given by $u : t \mapsto T_t^s f$. See, e.g., [35, Section 1.3 and 2.4] and [3, 27]. The map $t \mapsto T_t^s$ is strongly continuous on $[s, \infty)$. Furthermore, $\|T_t^s\|_{2\to 2} \leq e^{\alpha(t-s)}$ for some $\gamma \geq 0$ depending on $C_1 - C_3$, and $T_t^r = T_t^s \circ T_s^r$ for any $r \leq s \leq t$. Similarly, there exists a transition operator $(S^*)_t^s$ associated with $L_t^* + \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$. These transition operators preserve positivity.

Proposition 3.2. *There exists a measurable positive function $p : \mathbb{R} \times X \times \mathbb{R} \times X \to [0, \infty)$ with the following properties:*

(i) For every $t > s$, μ-a.e. $x, y \in X$ and every $f \in L^1(X,\mu) + L^\infty(X,\mu)$,

$$T_t^s f(y) = \int_X p(t,y,s,z) f(z) \mu(dz)$$

and

$$(S^*)_s^t f(y) = \int_X p(t,z,s,x) f(z) \mu(dz).$$

(ii) *For every $s < \sigma < \tau$ and μ-a.e. $x \in X$ the function*

$$u : (t, y) \mapsto p(t, y, s, x)$$

is a global solution of the equation $L_t u = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u$ on $(\sigma, \tau) \times X$ and for every $t > \tau > \sigma$ and μ-a.e. $y \in X$ the function

$$u : (s, x) \mapsto p(t, y, s, x)$$

is a global solution of the equation $L_s^* u = -\frac{\partial}{\partial s} u$ on $(\sigma, \tau) \times X$.

(iii) *For every $s < r < t$ and μ-a.e. $x, y \in X$,*

$$p(t, y, s, x) = \int_X p(t, y, r, z) p(r, z, s, x) \mu(dz).$$

(iv) *For every $s < t$,*

$$\int_X \int_X p(t, y, s, x)^2 \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \le e^{(-C_1^{-1}\lambda + \alpha)(t-s)}$$

where λ is the largest real such that $\mathcal{E}(f, f) \ge \lambda \|f\|_2^2$ for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$.

(v) *p is locally bounded on the set $\{(s, x, t, y) : s < t\}$.*

Proof. The proposition can be proved along the lines of [10, Lemma 3.7] and [35, Proposition 2.3]. □

Theorem 3.3. *For all $t > s$ and $x, y \in X$,*

$$p(t, y, s, x) \le C \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{d(x,y)^2}{C'(t-s)} + \beta(t - s)\right)}{V(x, \tau_x)^{\frac{1}{2}} V(y, \tau_y)^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

where $\tau_x = \sqrt{t - s} \wedge r_x$, $\tau_y = \sqrt{t - s} \wedge r_y$ and $\beta = C_2 + C_3 + C_3^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_5 + C_7 + \alpha$. The constants $C, C' > 0$ depend on C_1-C_7, D_Y, P_Y for $Y = Y_x$ and $Y = Y_y$.

Proof. See [35, Theorem 2.4]. □

Definition 3.4. *For a ball $B = B(a, r) \subset X$, the Dirichlet-type forms on B are defined as*

$$\mathcal{E}_{B,t}^D(f, g) = \mathcal{E}_t(f, g), \quad f, g \in D(\mathcal{E}_B^D),$$

where the domain $D(\mathcal{E}_B^D) = \mathcal{F}^0(B)$ is defined as the closure of the space $C_0^\infty(B)$ of all smooth functions with compact support in B. The closure is taken in the norm $\left(\mathcal{E}(f, f) + \int_B f^2 d\mu\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Let $T_B^D(t, s)$ be the associated transition operator and $p_B^D(t, y, s, x)$ the Dirichlet propagator.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $a \in X$ and $B = B(a, r_a/2)$.*

(i) For any fixed $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ there are constants $c, C \in (0,\infty)$ such that for any $x, y \in B(a,(1-\epsilon)r_a/2)$ and $0 < \epsilon(t-s) \le (r_a/2)^2$, the Dirichlet propagator p_B^D is bounded below by

$$p_B^D(t,y,s,x) \ge \frac{c}{V(x,\sqrt{t-s}\wedge R_x)} \exp\left(-C\frac{d(x,y)^2}{t-s}\right),$$

where $R_x = d(x,\partial B)/2$.

(ii) For any fixed $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ there are constants $c, C, C' \in (0,\infty)$ such that for any $x, y \in B$, $t-s \ge (\epsilon r_a/2)^2$, the Dirichlet propagator p_B^D is bounded above by

$$p_B^D(t,y,s,x) \le \frac{C}{V(a,r_a/2)} \exp\left(-\frac{c(t-s)}{r_a^2} + \beta(t-s)\right)$$

where $\beta = C_2 + C_3 + C_3^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_5 + C_7 + \alpha$.

(iii) There exist constants $c, C \in (0,\infty)$ such that for any $x, y \in B$, $t > s$, the Dirichlet propagator p_B^D is bounded above by

$$p_B^D(t,y,s,x) \le C\frac{\exp\left(-c\frac{d(x,y)^2}{t-s} + \beta(t-s)\right)}{V(x,\sqrt{t-s}\wedge(r_a/2))^{1/2}V(y,\sqrt{t-s}\wedge(r_a/2))^{1/2}}, \tag{3.3}$$

where $\beta = C_2 + C_3 + C_3^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_5 + C_7 + \alpha$.

All the constants c, C above depend only on C_1-C_3, and on D_Y, P_Y, C_4-C_7 and an upper bound on $(C_2 + C_3 + C_3^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_5 + C_7)r_a^2$ for $Y = B(a,r_a)$.

Proof. Statement (iii) follows from Theorem 3.3 and the set monotonicity of the kernel. To show the on-diagonal estimate in (i) we follow the proof of [32, Theorem 5.4.10]. Let $0 < \epsilon(t-s) \le (r_a/2)^2$ and $x \in B(a,(1-\epsilon)r_a/2)$. Let $r = \sqrt{t-s}\wedge R_x$. Let ψ be a smooth function such that $0 \le \psi \le 1$, $\psi = 1$ on $B(x,r)$ and $\psi = 0$ on $X \setminus B(x,2r)$. Define

$$u(t,y) = \begin{cases} T_B^D(t,s)\psi(y) & \text{if } t > s, \\ \psi(y) & \text{if } t \le s. \end{cases}$$

One can show that u is a local weak solution of

$$\hat{L}_t u = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}u \quad \text{on } Q' = (-\infty,+\infty)\times B(x,r),$$

where

$$\hat{L}_t = \begin{cases} L_t & \text{if } t > s, \\ L & \text{if } t \le s. \end{cases}$$

Applying the parabolic Harnack inequality of Theorem 2.13 to u and then to $p_B^D(\cdot,\cdot,s,z)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}1 = u(s,x) &\le C\, u(s+(t-s)/2,x)\\ &= C\int p_B^D(s+(t-s)/2,x,s,z)\psi(z)\mu(dz)\\ &\le C\int_{B(x,2r)} p_B^D(s+(t-s)/2,x,s,z)\mu(dz)\\ &\le C^2\, V(x,2r)\, p_B^D(s+(t-s)/2,x,s-(t-s)/2,x).\end{aligned}$$

Using volume doubling, we get

$$p_B^D(t,x,s,x) \ge \frac{C'}{V(x,r)}.$$

For the off-diagonal estimate, see the proof of [37, Theorem 4.8], and apply the parabolic Harnack inequality of Theorem 2.13.

To show (ii) we follow [13, Lemma 3.9 part 3]. Let $r = (\epsilon r_a/4)^2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{y,z\in B} p_B^D(t,y,s,z) &= \sup_{y,z\in B}\int p_B^D(t,y,(t+s)/2,x)p_B^D((t+s)/2,x,s,z)\mu(dx)\\ &= \sup_{y,z\in B}\left(\int p_B^D(t,y,(t+s)/2,x)^2\mu(dx)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\ &\quad \left(\int p_B^D((t+s)/2,x,s,z)^2\mu(dx)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\ &= \left\|T_B^D(t,(t+s)/2)\right\|_{2\to\infty}\left\|\left(S_B^D\right)^*((t+s)/2,s)\right\|_{2\to\infty}\\ &\le \left\|T_B^D\left(t,\frac{t+s}{2}+r\right)\right\|_{2\to 2}\left\|T_B^D\left(\frac{t+s}{2}+r,\frac{t+s}{2}\right)\right\|_{2\to\infty}\\ &\quad \left\|\left(S_B^D\right)^*(s+r,s)\right\|_{2\to 2}\left\|\left(S_B^D\right)^*\left(\frac{t+s}{2},s+r\right)\right\|_{2\to\infty}\\ &\le \left\|T_B^D\left(\frac{t+s}{2}+r,\frac{t+s}{2}\right)\right\|_{2\to\infty}\left\|\left(S_B^D\right)^*\left(\frac{t+s}{2},s+r\right)\right\|_{2\to\infty}\\ &\quad \exp\left((-(C_1)^{-1}\lambda_B+\alpha)(t-s)/4\right)\\ &\le \frac{C}{V(a,r_a/2)}\exp\left(-c\frac{t-s}{r_a^2}+\beta(t-s)\right)\end{aligned}$$

for some constants $c, C > 0$. Here λ_B is the lowest Dirichlet eigenvalue for the form $\mathcal{E}$ on B. By [13, Theorem 2.5], it holds $\lambda_B \ge \mathrm{const}\cdot r_a^{-2}$. □

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose* Assumptions 1, 2 *and* 4 *are satisfied. Then there are constants* $c, C, C' > 0$ *such that for any point* $a \in X$, *all* $x, y \in B(a, r_a/2)$ *and* $t > s$, *we have*

$$p(t,y,s,x) \ge c\frac{\exp\left(-C\frac{d(x,y)^2}{t-s}-\frac{C'}{r_a^2}(t-s)\right)}{V(x,\sqrt{t-s}\wedge(r_a/2))}.$$

The constants c, C, C' depend only on C_1-C_3, and on D_Y, P_Y, C_4-C_7 and an upper bound on $(C_2 + C_3 + C_3^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_5 + C_7)r_a^2$ for $Y = B(a, r_a)$.

Proof. From Theorem 3.5(i) we obtain an on-diagonal bound for $t - s < r_a^2$. The off-diagonal estimate (for any $t > s$) follows from the parabolic Harnack inequality. ☐

The following corollary provides a global two-sided heat kernel bound for situations that generalize the model case of the equation

$$\partial_t u = \sum_{i,j} \partial_j (a_{i,j}(t,x)\partial_i u)$$

on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with bounded measurable uniformly elliptic but not necessarily symmetric $(a_{i,j})$.

Corollary 3.7. *Suppose* Assumptions 1, 2 *and* 4 *are satisfied globally on $Y = X$ with $C_2 = C_3 = C_5 = C_7 = 0$. Then there are constants $c, C, c', C' > 0$ such that for any $x, y \in X$ and $t > s$, we have*

$$c\frac{\exp\left(-C'\frac{d(x,y)^2}{t-s}\right)}{V(x,\sqrt{t-s})} \le p(t,y,s,x) \le C\frac{\exp\left(-c'\frac{d(x,y)^2}{t-s}\right)}{V(x,\sqrt{t-s})}.$$

The constants $c, C, c', C' > 0$ depend only on C_1, C_4, C_6, D_X, P_X.

Note that, under the assumption of 3.7, Corollary 2.16 provides assorted global time-space Hölder continuity estimates for the heat kernel.

Remark 3.8. For the sake of simplicity, in the results described above, we have not tried to capture the sharpest possible Guassian upper bound as far as the constant in front of $\frac{d(x,y)^2}{(t-s)}$ in the exponential Gaussian factor is concerned. The reason is that this question is rather unnatural and somewhat irrelevant in the present context of time-dependent forms. We note that, with the parabolic Harnack inequality of Theorem 2.13 established, it is possible to obtain more detailed Gaussian upper bounds in spirit of [35] and [32, Section 5.2.3] by following the line of reasoning used in these references.

References

[1] D. G. Aronson and J. Serrin, *Local behavior of solutions of quasilinear parabolic equations*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 25 (1967), pp. 81–122.

[2] M. Biroli and U. Mosco, *A Saint-Venant type principle for Dirichlet forms on discontinuous media*, Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata, 169 (1995), pp. 125–181.

[3] J. A. van Casteren, *Markov processes, Feller semigroups and evolution equations*, Series on Concrete and Applicable Mathematics 12, World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2011, pp. xviii+805.

[4] Z.-Q. Chen and M. Fukushima, *Symmetric Markov processes, time change, and boundary theory*, vol. 35 of London Mathematical Society Monographs Series, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2012.

[5] N. Dinculeanu, *Vector measures*, International Series of Monographs in Pure and Applied Mathematics, 95, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1967.

[6] D. E. Edmunds, W. D. Evans, *Spectral theory and differential operators*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Oxford Science Publications, The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1987, pp. xviii+574.

[7] N. Eldredge and L. Saloff-Coste, *Widder's representation theorem for symmetric local Dirichlet spaces.* In preparation.

[8] E. B. Fabes and D. W. Stroock, *A new proof of Moser's parabolic Harnack inequality using the old ideas of Nash*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 96 (1986), pp. 327–338.

[9] M. Fukushima, Y. Ōshima, and M. Takeda, *Dirichlet forms and symmetric Markov processes*, vol. 19 of de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1994.

[10] A. Grigor'yan and J. Hu, *Upper bounds of heat kernels on doubling spaces.* Unpublished.

[11] A. A. Grigor′yan, *The heat equation on noncompact Riemannian manifolds*, Mat. Sb., 182 (1991), pp. 55–87.

[12] P. Gyrya and L. Saloff-Coste, *Neumann and Dirichlet heat kernels in inner uniform domains*, Astérisque, (2011), pp. viii+144.

[13] W. Hebisch and L. Saloff-Coste, *On the relation between elliptic and parabolic Harnack inequalities*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble), 51 (2001), pp. 1437–1481.

[14] Z.-C. Hu, Z.-M. Ma, and W. Sun, *On representations of non-symmetric dirichlet forms*, Potential Analysis, 32 (2010), pp. 101–131.

[15] D. Jerison and A. Sánchez-Calle, *Subelliptic, second order differential operators*, in Complex analysis, III (College Park, Md., 198586), vol. 1277 of Lecture Notes in Math., Springer, Berlin, (1987), pp. 46-77.

[16] Sobolev spaces, Laplacian, and heat kernel on Alexandrov spaces, Math. Z., 238 (2001), pp. 269–316.

[17] J. Lierl and L. Saloff-Coste, *Dirichlet heat kernel in inner uniform domains.* In preparation.

[18] ——, *Scale-invariant boundary Harnack principle in inner uniform domains.* Submitted.

[19] J.-L. Lions and E. Magenes, *Non-homogeneous boundary value problems and applications. Vol. I*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1972. Translated from the French by P. Kenneth, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 181.

[20] Z. M. Ma and M. Röckner, *Introduction to the theory of (nonsymmetric) Dirichlet forms*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.

[21] ——, *Markov processes associated with positivity preserving coercive forms*, Canad. J. Math., 47 (1995), pp. 817–840.

[22] U. Mosco, *Composite media and asymptotic Dirichlet forms*, J. Funct. Anal., 123 (1994), pp. 368–421.

[23] J. Moser, *A Harnack inequality for parabolic differential equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 17 (1964), pp. 101–134.

[24] ——, *Correction to: "A Harnack inequality for parabolic differential equations"*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 20 (1967), pp. 231–236.

[25] J. Moser, *On a pointwise estimate for parabolic differential equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 24 (1971), pp. 727–740.

[26] J. Nash, *Continuity of solutions of parabolic and elliptic equations*, Amer. J. Math., 80 (1958), pp. 931–954.

[27] James R. Norris and Daniel W. Stroock, *Estimates on the fundamental solution to heat flows with uniformly elliptic coefficients*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 62 (1991), no. 2, pp. 373-402.

[28] F. O. Porper and S. D. Èĭdel′man, *Two-sided estimates of the fundamental solutions of second-order parabolic equations and some applications of them*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk, 39 (1984), pp. 107–156.

[29] M. Renardy, R. C. Rogers, *An introduction to partial differential equations*, Texts in Applied Mathematics 13, Springer-Verlag, Berlin/New York, (1993).

[30] L. Saloff-Coste, *A note on Poincaré, Sobolev, and Harnack inequalities*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices, (1992), pp. 27–38.

[31] L. Saloff-Coste, *Parabolic Harnack inequality for divergence-form second-order differential operators*, Potential theory and degenerate partial differential operators (Parma), Potential Analysis, 4(4) (1995), pp. 429–467.

[32] L. Saloff-Coste, *Aspects of Sobolev-type inequalities*, vol. 289 of London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

[33] D. W. Stroock, *Diffusion semigroups corresponding to uniformly elliptic divergence form operators*, in Séminaire de Probabilités, XXII, vol. 1321 of Lecture Notes in Math., Springer, Berlin, 1988, pp. 316–347.

[34] K.-T. Sturm, *Analysis on local Dirichlet spaces. I. Recurrence, conservativeness and L^p-Liouville properties*, J. Reine Angew. Math., 456 (1994), pp. 173–196.

[35] ——, *Analysis on local Dirichlet spaces. II. Upper Gaussian estimates for the fundamental solutions of parabolic equations*, Osaka J. Math., 32 (1995), pp. 275–312.

[36] ——, *On the geometry defined by Dirichlet forms*, Seminar on Stochastic Analysis, Random Fields and Applications (Ascona, 1993), Progr. Probab., Birkhäuser, Basel, 36 (1995), pp. 231–242.

[37] ——, *Analysis on local Dirichlet spaces. III. The parabolic Harnack inequality*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9), 75 (1996), pp. 273–297.

[38] ——, *On the geometry of metric measure spaces. I.*, Acta Math., 196(1) (2006), pp. 65–131.

[39] J. Wloka, *Partielle Differentialgleichungen, Sobolevräume und Randwertaufgaben*, Teubner, Stuttgart, 1982.